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Section 1

Introduction

The Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan (hereafter referred to as Plan) is an articulation of the county’s community-driven goals and objectives for the next 10 to 20 years. Over the past year, the comprehensive planning process has engaged Leavenworth County residents and businesses through a variety of engagement exercises and events to identify issues, opportunities, and values related to land use, development, transportation, mobility, parks, open space, community facilities, and infrastructure. This input guided the creation of the Plan, and the guiding principles on the following page.

Section 1 - Introduction lays out the vision for Leavenworth County and discusses the guiding principles that are integrated into the Plan's recommendations. Additionally, this section sets the scene for the Plan, answering why this Plan was necessary, how the Plan will be used, and how the planning process took place.
Leavenworth County is at a crossroads. No longer is it considered a rural county, per its federal classification. Development pressures are on the rise, yet peaceful, picturesque, rolling lands still make up most of the county land. With the last Comprehensive Plan dating back to 2008, the time is now to update the vision and goals of the county to reflect its changing nature.

**Vision Statement**

Based on input gathered from stakeholders and members of the public during the public engagement process, as detailed in Section 3 - Community Engagement, a vision was crafted for the county. The vision is an expression of future aspirations and paints a picture of what is hoped for within the county. Each recommendation put forth in the Plan aims to achieve the vision, at least in part.

*Capitalizing on its abundance of open space, its rural heritage, hard-working residents, and its opportunities for development, Leavenworth County proactively balances urban growth and rural preservation, ensures a broad range of efficient and cost-effective government services and high quality of life for its residents, and anticipates and addresses the challenges of environmental quality, societal change, and economic competitiveness.*

**Guiding Principles**

Achieving such a vision is a complex process that requires a multi-layered approach. To help guide this process, the following guiding principles have been developed. These guiding principles are the most important ideas and influences that guide development in Leavenworth County over the next 10 to 20 years. The principles should be the foundation of all future county planning efforts, and the Plan’s more detailed recommendations aim to achieve one or more of these principles.

**Elevate and Compete**

Leavenworth County is poised for future growth and development of industry and commerce, given its access to highways, rail, and water, as well as its location on the edge of the Kansas City metropolitan area. This Plan sets a course for economic and transportation development that will lead to timely infrastructure development, balance industry and agriculture, and provide the foundation for well-paying jobs of all types. This Plan clearly defines Leavenworth County's role and potential in the region, elevating its strengths and mitigating its weaknesses.

**Preserve and Sustain**

Leavenworth County is predominantly agricultural/rural in nature. Even as industry and commerce has developed, the landscape is still defined by large expanses of rolling farmland and open space. To the extent possible, all new residential and commercial growth should be in municipalities or their growth areas. This Plan recognizes this character and seeks to maintain it through managed growth and development policies. The county also contains or is bordered by many environmental and ecological assets, such as Stranger Creek, the Kansas River, and the Missouri River. This Plan strives to capitalize on these assets, but also fully preserve the resulting ecological benefits.

**Communicate/Coordinate**

Leavenworth County is a mosaic of cities woven together by the rural and agricultural fabric of the county. This Plan recognizes this fabric and aims to preserve the unique identity of each community by coordinating the location, type, and design of future development and land use decisions with local goals. The county will establish consistent and modern lines of communication with each community and countywide residents to achieve transparency and enhanced public engagement in decision-making.

Note that Leavenworth County adheres to all local, state, and federal regulations (environmental and otherwise) and supports all private efforts to preserve and conserve natural areas and the agricultural heritage of the county.
Comprehensive Plan Overview

A comprehensive plan is a community effort. Many months, and sometimes years, of work go into the development of a strong, consensus-built comprehensive plan. People of all walks and stages of life work together to review the strengths and weaknesses of their community and develop a plan to bolster strengths and mitigate insufficiencies. They collaborate to develop a plan that presents a holistic vision for all aspects of the community and directs actions to realize the vision. Their work results in a comprehensive plan that is realistic in its reflection of the current condition, yet hopeful the presented vision can be achieved. The comprehensive plan is then adopted as a foundational document that will direct the growth of the community in the coming years.

A comprehensive plan is inherently hopeful. Comprehensive plans see the best in a community and plan wisely for what the community can do with its available resources. Simultaneously, comprehensive plans call the community to strive for what is best and sets challenging goals for itself. This unified vision is a reminder and a line in the sand to hold the community responsible for its actions. The comprehensive plan creates goals, strategies, plans, policies, programs, and projects for land use, transportation, housing, and more.

A comprehensive plan is a living document. Such a document must adapt to changing circumstances in and around the community. The world does not stop changing and static documents do not work when planning for the future. Comprehensive plans must meet the current needs of the community and be able to evolve as needs vary in the future. The comprehensive plan acts as the basis for how the community approaches a multitude of topics as they work to pinpoint the values and goals of the community. As the community grows, so will the comprehensive plan.
The Comprehensive Plan provides policy guidance for all of unincorporated Leavenworth County, and balances the needs of the various incorporated municipalities, clarifying their growth management areas.
The Why

Leavenworth County must proactively plan for growth, rather than reacting. This Plan is a way for the county to bring residents around a common vision and promises consistency for residents, developers, and businesses.

The last Comprehensive Plan was written in 2008 and must be updated to meet the new challenges and opportunities currently facing Leavenworth County. Over the past decade, society has evolved and technology has changed at a faster rate. These shifts have caused changes in expectations, values, and way of living throughout Leavenworth County. This update will reflect the shifting priorities to better equip the county in this ever-evolving atmosphere. This Plan will set the tone for resiliency within the county.

The Plan brings a new level of consistency and accountability to Leavenworth County. This Plan guides the direction of development and redevelopment within the county. The Plan, as it is supported by the community, will help all residents and stakeholders in Leavenworth County. Approvals of development and community budgets should be based on the goals and vision established in this Plan. This leads to consistent application of the regulations and policies in Leavenworth County. Residents can trust that development will proceed according to the zoning and land use recommendations shown in the Plan. The development community will be able to predict what type of development and where that development will be accepted within the county.

Legal Basis for Planning

The purpose and content of this Plan was prepared in accordance with Kansas Statute, which authorizes counties and county officers:

“...to prepare and adopt plans and land use regulations with multiple advisory bodies so as to bring unity, consistency, and efficiency to the county’s planning efforts. Such plans and regulation shall be designed, in accordance with the present and future needs of the county and shall promote the public health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare and protect the land, air, water, natural resources, and environment and encourage their use in a desirable manner and insure efficient expenditure of public funds and conserve and protect the values of property under jurisdiction of the county” (K.S.A. 19-2956).

Drafting and revising a comprehensive plan is one of the main ways in which county officials accomplish the aforementioned statute goals:

“The planning commission, with the approval of the Board of County Commissioners, may make or cause to be made a comprehensive plan for coordinated development of the county in the manner, and for the purposes, provided by this act” (K.S.A. 19-2958).

Once this document and the Future Land Use Map 2020 are signed by the Chair of the Planning Commission, attested by the County Clerk, and placed on file in the County Clerk’s office, the requirements of K.S.A. 19-2958 are fulfilled.

This Plan addresses each of the following subjects mentioned in the excerpt of K.S.A.19-2958 below. This Plan is the Board of County Commissioners’ recommendations regarding:

1. The general location, extent, and relationship of the use of land for agriculture, residence, business, industry, recreation, education, public buildings, and other community facilities, major utility facilities, both public and private, and any other use deemed necessary;
2. Population and building intensity standards and restrictions and the application of the same;
3. Public facilities including transportation facilities of all types, whether publicly or privately owned, which relate to the transportation of persons or goods;
4. Public improvement programming based upon a determination of relative urgency;
5. The major sources and expenditure of public revenue including long range financial plans for the financing of public facilities and capital improvements, based upon a projection of the economic and fiscal activity of the county, both public and private;
6. Utilization and conservation of natural resources; and
7. Any other element deemed necessary for the proper development or redevelopment of the area.
The Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan development process used a five-step program that included assessing existing conditions in the county, identifying issues and opportunities facing the county, formulating a clear vision for the future of the county, establishing guiding principles, developing and evaluating alternative plans, policies, and programs, and preparing the final plan recommendations in the form of this document. Figure 1.2 demonstrates the timeline of this planning process.

Figure 1.2

Project Phases

Planning Process and Timeline

Section 1 - Introduction
This section presents an introduction to the Plan, with a description of the Plan’s purpose, vision, and timeline.

Section 2 - County Profile
This section describes the current state of Leavenworth County, including its history, existing plans and studies, current and projected demographics, market potential, and physical, natural, and regulatory conditions.

Section 3 - Community Engagement
This section presents a summary of the input received from the community through a variety of engagement tools, both in-person and online.

Section 4 - Land Use and Development Plan
This section identifies the preferred and appropriate land uses and development areas throughout the county.

Section 5 - Transportation and Mobility Plan
This section provides recommendations to ensure the county’s transportation network (all modes) is of high quality and can safely and efficiently move all user types throughout the county and its regional destinations.

Section 6 - Community Facilities and Infrastructure Plan
This section provides a framework for coordinating, supporting, and enhancing community facilities and services throughout the county. This section seeks high-quality facilities and services for all county residents.

Section 7 - Implementation Plan
This section presents specific actions to achieve the recommendations of the previous sections.

Document Organization

This document is organized into seven sections, detailed as follows.
Section 2

County Profile

Long-range planning must be founded on an understanding of a community’s past and present. Section 2 - County Profile presents a summary of the analysis of the current state of the county, including a look into its history. This section acknowledges the importance of well-informed recommendations and strategies that properly respond to existing realities.

Section 2 - County Profile provides an overview of the county’s place and role within the region and its history, other regulating and guiding plans, demographic and economic trends, and physical and natural environment.
Leavenworth County is located in the northeastern corner of the State of Kansas and is part of the Kansas City Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), a 14-county area surrounding both Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas City, Kansas. Leavenworth County is approximately 469 square miles in area and bordered by Atchison County to the north, Douglas and Jefferson Counties to the west, the Kansas River and Johnson County on the south, Wyandotte County to the east, and the Missouri River to the northeast.

The county is physically and economically well-connected to the region. The county has access to the Kansas City MSA, as Interstate 70 (I-70) travels through the southern portion of the county and Interstate 435 (I-435) is close to the eastern border of the county.

Leavenworth County supports the economic health of the region; the American Community Survey (ACS) estimated that 30 percent of the county’s population worked outside the county in 2017. The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) estimates that, with no other support from entities within Leavenworth County, the federal government entities and facilities located within the county generate a multi-billion dollar investment in the Kansas City economy each year.

In 2013, MARC estimated that Fort Leavenworth, the Dwight D. Eisenhower Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the United States Penitentiary, and others, combined, create a $4.94 billion economic asset for the greater Kansas City region.

Leavenworth County is historically significant to Kansas, as it contains the oldest towns and settlements in the state. The City of Leavenworth is the “First City of Kansas,” the oldest town in the state, and was founded in 1854. It was incorporated in 1855 while Kansas was still a United States Territory. For a time in the 1800s, Leavenworth was the largest city in Kansas. The development of the county and the City of Leavenworth is linked to Fort Leavenworth, which is the third oldest military installation in the nation, and the oldest military installation located west of the Mississippi River. The Fort was established in 1827, a few decades before the Town of Leavenworth was incorporated. Both the fort and city have provided the foundation of growth for the county during its long history.

Even before the foundation of Leavenworth, the Lewis and Clark Expedition traveled up the Missouri River and, on July 2, 1804, stopped at a location now considered to be within the current city limits of Leavenworth.
As one of the original counties of the State of Kansas, Leavenworth County is one location where the fight over whether Kansas would be a free state or a slave state took place, as the Territory of Kansas tried to gain admittance into the United States (U.S.). The county witnessed pro-slavery advocates cross the Missouri River in attempt to influence Kansas to vote in favor of slavery many times, but the residents of the, then, Kansas Territory were able to persevere and bring the territory into the Union as a free state. The leaders of Leavenworth submitted a draft of the Kansas Constitution, which was deemed too radical in its anti-slavery stance by the legislature and ultimately rejected during the constitutional convention in 1859.

Before and after the Civil War, Leavenworth County was known as a manufacturing center. Manufacturers produced stoves, mill and mining machinery, steam engines, wagons, carriages, furniture, shoes, pumps, sap, bridges, boilers, and mechanical musical instruments according to a report to the Board of Directors of the Kansas State Historical Society in 1916. The presence of these manufacturers helped Leavenworth become the most populated county in Kansas until the 1880s.

### Leavenworth County Cities

**Basehor**

Basehor was founded in 1889 and incorporated as a city in 1965. The first individuals to own land, upon which Basehor now stands, were Thomas Salem and Mary Towne. This couple bought the land from the railroad in 1873 and sold it to Ephraim Basehor on January 9, 1874. In 1889, Ephraim plotted the land and began building the town site, dedicating the town on November 30, 1889. The 2018 ACS estimates Basehor’s population to be 6,194.

**Bonner Springs**

Bonner Springs was settled in 1812, platted in 1855, and incorporated in 1898. In the 1880s, Philo Clark platted the town site and renamed the area Bonner Springs. Philo Clark became the first mayor when the city was incorporated. The 2018 ACS estimates Bonner Springs’ population at 7,804 people. Bonner Springs is part of Wyandotte, Leavenworth, and Johnson counties.

**De Soto**

De Soto is a city within two counties, Johnson and Leavenworth. De Soto was founded in 1857 and named after the Spanish explorer Hernando de Soto. The city saw modest growth in its population from the 1860s through the 1940s when the Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant was built to support the war effort. De Soto had grown from 400 people to over 1,000 in less than a year. The city has continued to grow modestly since the plant closed in 1948 and today is a bedroom community for the Kansas City MSA to the east and Lawrence MSA to the west. The 2018 ACS estimates De Soto’s population at 6,443 people.

**Easton**

Easton was established in 1855 and incorporated in 1903. Despite its small size, Easton has a lengthy history within the county, seeing multiple fights associated with the question of slavery before Kansas entered the Union. During its early years, Easton lost its general store when it was “destroyed by border ruffians” in 1856. The 2018 ACS estimates Easton’s population at 260 people.

**Lansing**

Lansing was incorporated as a city in 1959, yet its roots reach back to the 1860s when the state penitentiary was built in 1867. The prison attracted a small population that began building homes and businesses. In 1878, ninety acres of land were plotted and the Town of Lansing was created. Incorporation was delayed, twice by the Leavenworth County Commissioners, over the next one hundred years, but after an organized effort in the late 1950s, the city was incorporated in 1959. The 2018 ACS estimates Lansing’s population at 11,964 people.

**Leavenworth**

Leavenworth is the county seat and the oldest continuous settlement in the county. The city was founded in 1854 and incorporated the next year. Leavenworth became the county seat after a lengthy fight and multiple elections over the course of years. The conflict centered around the question of slavery. Leavenworth was led by members of the “Free State” faction, while the Kickapoo and Delaware Townships were led by pro-slavery factions. Leavenworth lost three separate elections to become the county seat, yet appealed the third election to the District Court on the basis of election fraud. The court overturned the election results and made Leavenworth the county seat. The county seat has remained unchanged since. The 2018 ACS estimates Leavenworth’s population at 36,062 people.

**Linwood**

Linwood was established in 1867 and incorporated in 1895. The town was platted on both sides of Stranger Creek, near its mouth at the Kansas River. The 2018 ACS estimates Linwood’s population at 391 people.

**Tonganoxie**

Tonganoxie was established in 1866 when 40 acres of property owned by Magdalena Berry was platted. A mill was built and operated early in Tonganoxie’s history. Today, 5,524 people are estimated to live within the 2,350 acres of the city, per the 2018 ACS estimates.
Past Plans and Studies

Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan (2008)

The current Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan was adopted in June 2008 and has since served as the official policy document to guide present and future growth, development and redevelopment, land use patterns, and infrastructure improvements in the county over a 20-year planning period. In addition to these areas of focus, the 2008 Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan established a long-term community vision and goals to ensure the inevitable growth and development stayed true to local values.

At the time of the current comprehensive plan’s adoption, population was expanding and anticipated to continue, placing additional pressures on infrastructure capacity, physical land use patterns, community well-being, natural resources, and the overall aesthetics of Leavenworth County. The efforts of this planning process also coordinated with local municipalities and planning institutions to ensure recommendations were appropriate from the neighborhood level to a regional scale.

Several significant issues were at play at the time of the 2008 plan’s adoption that remain relevant during this current comprehensive planning effort, including:

- Enhance transportation connectivity to increase access to the Kansas City metropolitan area while enhancing mobility countywide;
- Maintain the desired feel and character in the rural parts of Leavenworth County with rising suburbanization and urbanization;
- Preserve agricultural resources and viability, alongside other natural resources; and,
- Provide a variety of housing choices at varying price points while honoring the legacy of historic sites and structures.

The primary focus of the 2008 plan was land use. The overall land use goal centered on achieving compatible physical and economic coexistence of rural residences, agriculture, and the growing cities. Harmony between expanding urban areas and dedicated farmlands was to be achieved primarily through the preservation of resources, clustered development, land use buffers, and adequate infrastructure. Through proper planning and land use controls, the plan promised to guide future land use patterns within Leavenworth County in a way that maintained the rural and agriculture heritage while providing for economic opportunities as the development pressures continued. The 2008 plan set forth 12 implementation program priorities. The following table summarizes how these priorities were or were not implemented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Program Priority</th>
<th>Status and Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop interlocal agreement with the cities</td>
<td>Not accomplished: Lack of political will; in 2018-2019 Basehor attempted to develop an agreement, however, their City Council did not adopt the agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Public Utilities Commission (PUC)</td>
<td>Not accomplished: Staffing issues and building codes committee took precedence; however, there will be a PUC organized by the end of 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop County Road 1 interchange master plan</td>
<td>Accomplished: CR-1 land use plan adopted in 2019; county is pursuing the possible rezoning of the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amend zoning codes to match comprehensive plan</td>
<td>Partially accomplished: Developed guidelines for family farmstead exceptions; however, other than that, and creating development guidelines for the CR-1, political will has lacked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezone the county to match comprehensive plan</td>
<td>Not accomplished: Lack of political will and infrastructure to support some of the zoning districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a parks and recreation department</td>
<td>Not accomplished: Lack of political will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create road standards with Public Works Department</td>
<td>Partially accomplished: Public Works Department updating road standards; however, trail or scenic parkways standards likely not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage the floodplain</td>
<td>Partially accomplished: Floodplain Manager reviews development within the floodplain to ensure it meets or exceeds our floodplain regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the solid waste and recycling programs</td>
<td>Partially accomplished: Solid Waste Committee meets quarterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop standards for multimodal transportation</td>
<td>Not accomplished: Lack of political will and funding issues; Leavenworth County Transit Plan (2018) completed in coordination with MARC and RideKC, but no implementation of the plan to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and construct county gateways</td>
<td>Not accomplished: Historically, this was not a priority for Planning Staff and was not brought to the Commissioners’ attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the comprehensive plan annually</td>
<td>Accomplished: The comprehensive plan is reviewed every year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to a partnership amongst Leavenworth County, the City of Tonganoxie, and the Kansas Turnpike Authority (KTA), a land use analysis was necessary to form a future vision for the County Road 1 (CR-1) corridor upon completion of the CR-1 and I-70 interchange. The Leavenworth County Road 1 Land Use Analysis studied the existing land development conditions within the six-mile study area located between Tonganoxie’s southern limits and Kansas Highway 32 (K-32) in Leavenworth County. After establishing the baseline conditions of land use, demographics, development patterns, and infrastructure, and completing a public engagement process, recommended options for future land development within the CR-1 corridor were created, alongside design guidance.

Overall goals for the CR-1 corridor planning process included the following:

- Ensure future development patterns protect and preserve natural resources;
- Align existing roadway and public utilities infrastructure with proposed development;
- Improve the corridor’s scenic and rural residential character;
- Concentrate commercial, industrial, and/or a mix of uses at targeted activity centers (e.g., primary roadway intersections/interchanges); and,
- Generate economic development interest in the study area.

Two future land use concepts culminated from the CR-1 study, Concept A and Concept B, described as follows.

**Concept A:** Considered the optimistic approach, the future land development in Concept A is based on the goals and strategies desired by the public, and a range of land use development categories from open space and agricultural preserve to high density residential and medium industrial. This concept, based on population projections alone, may take more than 40 years to realize. This is the preferred concept from this planning process.

Key features of Concept A include primarily mixed uses east, northeast, and southeast of the I-70/CR-1 interchange, with open space designated along the entirety of Stranger Creek, as seen in the figure on the following page. Medium intensity industrial uses are proposed west of this interchange. South of Cantrell Road, the area is almost exclusively reserved for open space, except for the intersection of CR-1 and Linwood Road, which is slated for commercial. North of the I-70 and CR-1 interchange exhibits much higher density of uses compared to south of the interchange, with a wide range of land uses including commercial, varying residential density developments, and mixed use/mixed use cluster.

**Concept B:** Coined as the conservative approach, this concept is projected to take 20 years to achieve. It includes a different land development pattern than Concept A, but still utilized similar land use types.

Concept B takes a much different approach to land use development patterns, leaving almost the entire CR-1 study area designated to rural residential and open space, as shown in the figure to the right. North of Honey Creek Road, the residential areas proposed are slated for residential estate, which would include larger lots than the higher density residential areas proposed in Concept A for the same area. At the I-70/CR-1 interchange, medium industrial and mixed use are proposed identically as they are to the other concept, as well as the commercial proposed at the intersection of Linwood Road and CR-1. The primary difference between the approaches is that Concept A proposed much more development compared to Concept B.

In addition to analyzing land use within the study area, design guidance was provided to ensure a certain look and feel for the CR-1 corridor as it experiences growth and development. Design guidance was provided for buildings and lots, open spaces, circulation, parking, signage, and landscape and buffering. This design guidance is also intended to supplement the standards applied in the CR-1 Special Development District (SDD), which is an area within the CR-1 corridor that spans approximately from Honey Creek Road on the north to Golden Road on the south, and from 230th Street on the west to 214th Street on the east.
Future Land Use Concept A
(Leavenworth County Road 1 Land Use Analysis)

Future Land Use Concept B
(Leavenworth County Road 1 Land Use Analysis)

The City of Lansing sits in the eastern part of Leavenworth County and is the second most populous city in the county. In October 2014, the City of Lansing adopted the Lansing 2030: A Vision for Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan, which was guided by the vision of creating a “vibrant, growing community in a safe and attractive environment that consists of quality residential neighborhoods, a superior education system, and strong viable business interests; and provides a variety of community services and activities which promote individual growth, family unity, and spirit of community.”

Since previous updates of the comprehensive plan, prior to 2014, significant development had occurred in the City of Lansing leading to the 2014 update, including residential, commercial, and industrial development, alongside major street and public utility improvements. This development, coupled with population growth, merited an update to the comprehensive plan, which focused on four major categories: land use, transportation, community facilities/services, and future growth.

Land Use: The increase in population since the previous update created a need for housing, which led to the predominant land use type being residential, specifically single-family. With the aging population, the trend in residential development is anticipated to change from single-family homes to higher density residential development, including townhomes, apartment complexes, and dedicated senior housing institutions.

Another factor the City of Lansing addressed regarding the increasing population, was to grow its existing retail establishments. According to a market study the city conducted, Lansing residents do not have their retail needs met within city limits, and thus are forced outside of Lansing to meet these needs. This economic loss was addressed by establishing some new businesses; however, the comprehensive plan indicates that a greater emphasis must be placed on retail establishments as it proceeds with redevelopment and revitalization efforts along Main Street.

Transportation: The Seven and Nine Mile Creeks are significant factors when it comes to transportation planning within the City of Lansing, as well as Leavenworth County, as they can only be crossed by bridge, restricting the number of north-south connections within the city. Further, Lansing’s Main Street is also U.S. Highway 73/Kansas Highway 7 (K-7) which generates average daily traffic counts of over 25,000 vehicles, greatly impacting the development opportunities, as well as non-vehicular access along this primary thoroughfare.

Community Facilities/Services: This section of the plan addresses the parks and recreation system, public safety, utilities, community and activity centers, library education, and other public facilities. The City of Lansing seeks to improve existing community facilities and services while providing space for additional development of this type as it is described as a primary way to attract more visitors, as well as future residents to increase its tax base.

Future Growth: The future of Lansing is to remain primarily residential, especially west of Main Street/Highway 73/K-7. There are clearly defined commercial, business, and mixed use corridors along Main Street and East Eisenhower Road (adjacent to the City of Leavenworth’s southern boundary) outlined in the Future Land Use Map, addressing the need for increased retail. Enhancing and revitalizing the development along these existing major thoroughfares allows the city to preserve natural resources while capitalizing on the areas suitable for development. It should be noted that the comprehensive plan does not just desire development for the sake of development, but rather aspires to create high-quality growth patterns with a focus on revitalization of older areas of the city.
U.S. 24/40 Corridor Study (2007)
The U.S. Route 24/40 (U.S. 24/40) Corridor Study was adopted in 2007 and amended in 2008 as a partnership amongst the cities of Basehor and Tonganoxie, Leavenworth County, the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT), and MARC. The corridor area encompassed one mile on either side of U.S. 24/40 from Honey Creek Road on the west to K-7 on the east. The purpose for the study was to protect and preserve the transportation investment in the corridor area through thoughtful land use and transportation planning and management principles. The study process included design guidelines to safeguard the aesthetic quality of the corridor in the face of development pressures.

A corridor economic study and market assessment indicated that the number of business establishments, employment opportunities, and size of the labor force outpaced Leavenworth County and the Kansas City metropolitan area, demonstrating the economic importance of the corridor. To maintain and grow the economic development opportunities within the corridor area, improvements to the U.S. 24/40 were necessary as transportation access has a direct impact on an area’s opportunity to retain and attract new businesses.

The presence of natural resources played a significant role in the development of recommendations and policies. Not only did the public process indicate a strong desire to preserve and enhance natural features within and surrounding the corridor area, planning for future roadway networks are inherently dependent on the environment in which they are being constructed. Preservation of the views and floodplain associated with Stranger Creek also contributed to the maintenance of the rural character that was important to those living and traveling in the corridor area.

The study used transects to illustrate future development areas, access management standards, and urban design guidelines for the corridor. Although these transition zones differ from zoning, they were reflective of the long-range land use plans for the county and cities. The corridor was subdivided into five transects, ranging from least developed T1 (Natural Zone) to the most developed T5 (City Center Zone). Generally, the most developed/urbanized areas are planned for in and surrounding the City of Tonganoxie. The central part of the U.S. 24/40 corridor, approximately between 208th Street and 166th Street, is proposed for natural areas and rural long-term development patterns. From the City of Basehor to the eastern corridor area, density increases with more suburban and urban development patterns proposed.

A basic major street plan considered the supporting road network and major access points along with potential future connections. Due to limits in funding, interim improvements to the corridor recommended elements to address safety issues with rising traffic volumes such as relocating and/or adding signals, widening the U.S. 24/40 Highway for a center turn lane or median, removal of median breaks, shared or consolidated driveways, and additional turn lanes. A refined travel demand model was also developed, and showed only incremental increases in traffic for 2030.

A traffic safety analysis identified where safety modifications should be concentrated throughout the corridor. After comparing collision rates with the statewide averages, each type of section was over the state average. These findings support the application of medians, driveway reductions, and access management practices recommended in the plan.

Multimodal aspects of the corridor are limited. While there are paved shoulders on both sides of the highway, bicyclists are not encouraged along the corridor. Existing right-of-way was inventoried to better understand the limitations of widening the corridor. While sufficient right-of-way exists in the four and five lane sections, areas with less than four lanes will require additional right-of-way. As developments are proposed in these areas, dedicating needed right-of-way will be more reasonable.

To implement the plan, the study charged local agencies to adopt an interlocal agreement to formalize the partnership of the entities that created this study, to execute the implementation action plan, to further explore the greenway trail system acquisition and implementation options, and to secure funding resources for the plan. This interlocal agreement was put into place for 20 years and is still in force at the time of this document. The following items have been completed:

- Added section to KDOT’s Access Management Policy regarding the addition of the U.S. 24/40 planned corridor;
- Permitted access on the corridor by KDOT in various locations;
- Added a traffic signal at the Tonganoxie High School intersection (U.S. 24/40 and Main Street);
- Added a traffic signal at the intersection of 158th Street and U.S. 24/40;
- Added an auxiliary lane at 142nd Street and U.S. 24/40; and
- Installed turn lanes at 1423nd Street and U.S. 24/40.
**K-7 Corridor Management Plan (2006)**

The K-7 Corridor Management Study was the result of a two-year effort with KDOT, MARC, KTA, and neighboring communities to complete a comprehensive study of the K-7 Corridor from 223rd Street in Spring Hill, north to Kansas Highway 5 (K-5)/Muncie Road in Leavenworth. Project objectives included:

- Determining facility type;
- Developing access requirements and street network system;
- Determining right-of-way preservation needs;
- Developing a phased implementation plan given lack of funding; and
- Executing memorandums of understanding (MOU).

Following input on future land uses from the surrounding communities, a traffic forecast was developed resulting in a recommended freeway facility for the corridor. While not all communities agreed completely with the freeway facility, everyone agreed with the importance of preserving right-of-way needed for future roadway widening and potential interchanges.

Limited funding does not allow for the facility to be completed as of now, but it will be critical to make interim improvements in accommodating future growth in traffic. These interim improvements included elements such as adding traffic signals and turn lanes where future interchanges are proposed, reducing access, and preserving land for enhancements.

Implementation of the plan was broken into MOUs where roles and responsibilities were developed with appropriate partner agencies and communities in mind. Additionally, a K-7 Corridor Review Committee was created, made up of KDOT representatives and local communities. The committee is tasked with meeting to review the plan and evaluate progress or any issues regarding land development or compliance with the plan.

**Route 92 Centennial Bridge Study (2016)**

KDOT completed a study in August 2016 on the aging Route 92 Centennial Bridge. This bridge crosses the Missouri River, connecting Leavenworth County and Platte County over the state line. The study examined the existing conditions of the bridge, including the bridge conditions, multimodal transportation network, traffic characteristics, and environmental features. According to the findings, along with the forecasted conditions, the study concluded that the bridge should be replaced. A handful of locations for new bridge corridors were selected and cost estimates were completed. The study also suggested tolling as a source of revenue. Next steps included a location for the new bridge, design recommendations, and costs. The project was halted in 2017 due to budgeting.
5-County Regional Transportation Study (2013)

KDOT, MARC, and the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning Organization completed this two-phase study in March 2013 to assess the transportation needs of the fastest growing region in the State of Kansas to guide sustainable enhancements to the regional transportation system. Douglas, Johnson, Leavenworth, Miami, and Wyandotte counties were included in the study. Phase one assessed the multimodal transportation needs for the five counties, with a large emphasis on stakeholder outreach and public input. As a result of the outreach, five primary themes emerged and were used to guide the study recommendations:

1. Create a multimodal transportation system that provides choice and supports economic vitality of the region;
2. Focus on moving people and freight rather than on moving vehicles;
3. Invest in a transportation system that promotes the region's long-range vision and community goals and objectives;
4. Seek to maximize the vitality of social, economic, and environmental system systems when making transportation investments; and
5. Maintain and invest in the existing transportation system.

Phase two prioritized the region’s needs. Three stakeholder groups provided guidance throughout this phase: the Stakeholder Advisory Panel, the Corridor Strategies Working Group, and the Travel Demand Model Technical Committee. Seventeen key transportation corridors throughout the five counties were evaluated. The following Leavenworth County corridors were analyzed:

**K-92 Corridor:** Kansas highway K-92 and Missouri highway M-92 connect Fort Leavenworth to Kansas City International Airport. The corridor contains the Centennial Bridge, which crosses the Missouri River and connects the two states. This corridor is significant because Fort Leavenworth is one of the largest single users of the airport and this route is the primary access point. Recommendations for this route include an incident management plan for the Centennial Bridge, widening the bridge, and implementing a toll in accordance with the recommendations of the toll feasibility study.

**I-70 Corridor:** I-70 is a major east-west route through the State of Kansas and operates as a toll facility from the western border of Leavenworth County through the K-7 and I-70 interchange and passes by many local attractions, in addition to leading to Kansas City to the east, Topeka to the west, and beyond. Development along this corridor continues to be anticipated, and the recommendation strategies align as such. Areas of focus for recommended strategies include improving safety and traffic flow and increasing use of bus services and carpooling.

**K-7 / US-73 / US-169 Corridor:** Also designated as US-73 in Leavenworth County, K-7 is a north/south corridor that connects four of the five counties in the study along the western edge of the Kansas City metropolitan area. This route changes in capacity and speed limits as it moves south towards Olathe, but in Leavenworth, it features many traffic signals and intersections, reducing the capacity of the highway and increasing travel times. Recommended strategies for the portion of K-7 in Leavenworth County include implementing a transit service that connects to existing services in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

**K-5 Corridor:** K-5 splits from K-7 in Leavenworth County and travels southeast to connect to I-435. The winding, two-lane road has low speeds and low traffic levels. The recommended strategy for the corridor is to conduct a study for a potential realignment between K-7 and I-435.

**U.S. 24/40 Corridor:** The U.S. 24/40 corridor serves rural Leavenworth County, connecting Douglas County to Bonner Springs and Village West. Increasing development and anticipated growth in Bonner Springs and Village West influenced the recommendations for the corridor to support a higher traffic capacity. In addition, U.S. 24/40 provides an alternative east/west route to I-70 that avoids tolls. It will continue to demand a growing traffic capacity.
Conveniently Connected: Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (Tonganoxie) (2010)
In Tonganoxie, planning efforts were made to review their roadway network and evaluate how to better accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians. The adopted Conveniently Connected: Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan defines complete streets as “designed and operated to enable safe access for all users (pedestrian, bicyclist and motorists) of all ages and abilities along and across the street.”

According to the plan, complete street modifications were made to the local roadway network designations as well as identifying locations for future greenway trails, and greenway parks. For each roadway functional classification, modified street standards were recommended, such as appropriate bicyclist, pedestrian, and sidewalk facilities. Additional elements considered in the design guidelines for complete streets included drainage, on-street parking, landscape, street furniture, and expanded bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan (2015)
The Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan presents a regional network of bikeways, with over 2,000 miles of on-road and off-road facilities spanning eight counties in the bistate region. Benefits of the network include safe, alternative transportation networks, reductions to auto dependency and emissions, and health benefits from increasing opportunities for physical activity. The plan was created over a year and included public engagement, input from city and county officials, open house workshops, and online mapping to identify and prioritize important corridors.

The plan recommendations are as follows:
- A prioritized network of regional bikeways to support regional and local planning and investment in active transportation;
- Regional planning and coordination to help implement the plan by creating and sustaining necessary partnerships;
- Data collection and technical capacities to update and maintain GIS information on constructed, programmed, and planned bikeways and trails; accurate user counts; and crash data;
- Education and encouragement campaigns to raise public awareness of bikeway and trail resources in the region and educate the public about safe driving, walking, and cycling behaviors;
- Enforcement efforts to allow all users to share a safe roadway system and address roadway safety issues; and
- Encouraging national designation applications to support communities that apply for Bicycle Friendly Community and Walk Friendly Community recognition.

At the time of the plan’s development, Leavenworth County had 27.2 Share the Road miles and 16.3 miles of shared use paths. The plan proposes a total of 136 miles of regional bikeways for Leavenworth County. Proposed bicycle corridors through the county run west to east crossing the Centennial Bridge into Platte County, and south through Tonganoxie to Douglas County, through Basehor to De Soto, and into the Kansas City metropolitan area. The plan further distinguishes the corridor on the Centennial Bridge across the Missouri River as high priority. Leavenworth County routes are part of a larger conceptual vision for the Lewis and Clark Route, an approximately 165-mile route connecting northern portions of Leavenworth, Platte, and Clay counties.
Leavenworth County Transit Plan (2018)

MARC, in partnership with the region’s four transit agencies – Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA), Johnson County Transit, Unified Government Transit, and IndeBus – are currently updating the RideKC Regional Transit Plan through the SmartMoves 3.0 initiative. A major component of the SmartMoves 3.0 initiative is connecting areas with limited existing transit service that have a growing need for access to jobs and activity centers. Leavenworth County, and specifically the City of Leavenworth, is a growing activity center due to the expansion of the business park in southern Leavenworth.

Short-term and long-term alternatives for improving transit operations were developed and evaluated. From these alternatives, a preferred strategy was identified to meet the needs in the most cost-effective manner.

Two transit service alternatives were developed and evaluated, but ultimately Alternative 1 was chosen. Alternative 1 focused on meeting the need for travel within the City of Leavenworth. This alternative serves the community’s transit dependent population including older adults, persons with disabilities, and low-income households. The service was designed to provide access to medical and social service providers, shopping, educational opportunities, and other public services and facilities such as libraries and community centers.

Alternative 1 represented the most promising strategy for addressing near-term public transit service needs in the Leavenworth-Lansing area. It can effectively serve the intra-community transportation needs of the transit dependent population within the service area, can be operational in a very short period of time, is adaptable to changing conditions and needs, provides transit access to most of the City of Leavenworth, and can be expanded to include Lansing. This service also has the potential to grow in the future, depending on ridership patterns. There is the possibility to convert this service into flex or fixed-route service.

However, there are needs that are not effectively met or not met at all by Alternative 1, particularly the need to connect Leavenworth County to the regional transit system. This need can only be met through the introduction of a connector service such as Alternative 2. This is a need that, while identified through discussions with stakeholders and through survey data collected from the public, appears to be a lower priority in the near-term. Long-term, as the regional transit network is improved and expanded, including Alternative 2 as part of a long-term transit development strategy for Leavenworth County and the Kansas City region should be considered.

The recommended near-term transit service strategy identified for Leavenworth County involves the introduction of a flexible, on-demand service covering a defined area of the City of Leavenworth. The service would operate using passenger vehicles with a 12 to 20 person capacity. Trips would need to be requested by users in advance. This service would be available Monday to Friday from approximately 6:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m.

The long-term transit strategy includes a connector service between the City of Leavenworth and the Village West retail/entertainment district in western Wyandotte County. From this point, passengers could make connections to the regional transit network.
Land Use and Zoning

Land Use
Land use – now and in the future – will, in part, define the character of the county. Compared to other counties in the Kansas City MSA, Leavenworth County is unique, as the county is an agricultural-based community. In fact, 235,000 acres of land in Leavenworth County is used for agricultural purposes. Eighty-two percent of the land available within the county is used by residents to produce food or raise animals.

Figure 2.1 shows the percentage of acreage breakdown for land uses within the county. Figure 2.2 shows the distribution of land uses within the county. The definition of each land use is provided below:

- **Agricultural**: Farming and forestry
- **Commercial and Industrial**: Service, retail, office, manufacturing, processing, fabrication, and/or packaging uses
- **Exempt**: Religious facilities, governmental, and military uses
- **Farm Homesite**: Property used as a residence that also produces plants or animals
- **Vacant**: Unoccupied land with few to no structures and no primary use
- **Residential**: Homes, both single-family and multi-family
- **Utility/Semi-Public/Public**: Governmental, utilities, and educational uses

Zoning
Leavenworth County uses an official zoning map and subdivision regulations to regulate land usage, the intensity of those uses, and the interactions between various land uses.

Zoning regulations exist to regulate development to protect the health, safety, prosperity, and general welfare of Leavenworth County residents.

Leavenworth County is unique in that it has little difference in its zoning types. Over 95 percent of the county is zoned as a rural zoning designation. The county’s zoning allows for the rural land to be used simultaneously as agricultural and residential, which supports the high percentage of agriculture usage mentioned prior.

Figure 2.3 shows the distribution of zoning districts within the county. A definition for each zoning district is provided on page 19.
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No County Zoning
R: Rural - Agricultural and Residential
- RR – 2.5 (2.5 acre minimum)
- RR – 5 (5 acre minimum)
- RR – 40 (40 acre minimum)

Rural zoning is intended to allow for farming on property while also allowing residential uses on the same land.

R-1: Rural - Single-Family Residential
- R-1(10) (10,000 square feet minimum)
- R-1(15) (15,000 square feet minimum)
- R-1(43) (43,560 square feet minimum)

R-1 is intended for low density single-family residential development. Land uses that are compatible with single-family dwellings, such as educational facilities, farms, and public uses are all allowed by right within this district. This zoning allows a maximum of four units per acre on property zoned R-1.

R-2: Single-Family Residential
R-2 is intended for single-family residential development. Land uses that are compatible with single-family dwellings, such as educational facilities, farms, and public uses are all allowed by right within this district. Seven to eight units per acre are allowed on property zoned R-2.

R-3: Two-Family Residential
R-3 is intended for single-family attached dwelling residential development. Any land uses allowed in R-1 or R-2 are also allowed within this district. R-3 zoning allows a maximum of seven or eight units per acre on property zoned R-2.

R-4: Apartment Residential
R-4 zoning is designed to support the widest range of residential options available, including apartments. R-4 zoning allows the development of 28 to 29 units per acre on R-4 zoned property.

B-1: Neighborhood Business
B-1 zoning is intended to support the development of any use allowed in R-4 zoning and the development of a number of business types.

B-2: Limited Business
B-2 zoning is intended to support a stable and wide variety of local retail and office developments.

B-3: General Business
B-3 zoning is intended to support the widest and most intense commercial uses, including retail, business, and office uses.

I-1: Limited Industrial
I-1 is for a developing stable or redeveloping area representing light industrial uses and having a relatively high intensity of use and land coverage.

I-2: Light Industrial
I-2 is for a developing stable or redeveloping area representing light and heavy industrial uses and having a high intensity of use and land coverage.

I-3: Heavy Industrial
I-3 is for a developing stable or redeveloping area representing heavy industrial uses and having the highest intensity of use and land coverage.

PUD: Planned Unit Development
PUD is intended to allow creative uses of land by creating a zoning district tailored for each property’s specific use and land coverage. The developer will negotiate the allowed uses and the zoning requirements with the county staff members, Planning Commission, and Board of County Commissioners in order to create a development unique to Leavenworth County.
County Facilities and Services

Essential services and facilities are provided by the government that safeguard public well-being. Included in these essential services and facilities are fire and police protection, community facilities, schools, parks and recreation facilities, utilities, and solid waste management. These services are foundational to a sustainable and vibrant community. They provide space and services for the residents to maintain the quality of life residents expect as they choose to live in Leavenworth County. Community facilities should work in harmony as they encourage social cohesion and a better quality of life for all residents of the county.

It is essential to understand what and where community facilities are within the county, as these facilities help to facilitate growth and increases in quality of life. Such facilities need to be developed in a thoughtful and measured way to provide the adequate level of service for all residents within the county. The development pattern, economy, health, and safety of the county will all be affected by the location and quality of community facilities throughout the county.

County Buildings

Public buildings are essential to the life and health of many community facilities. The following is an overview of buildings used by Leavenworth County to provide services for its residents.

**County Courthouse:** The Leavenworth County Courthouse is located in the City of Leavenworth at the corner of Walnut and 3rd Streets, just south of downtown Leavenworth and immediately west of the Justice Center. This courthouse was built in 1911 on the foundations of the original courthouse that was damaged by a significant fire in 1911. Today, the courthouse contains most county administrative departments, including Administration, Appraiser, Clerk/Election, Board of County Commissioners, Emergency Management, GIS, Planning and Zoning, Public Works, Register of Deeds, Treasurer, and Surveyor.

**Justice Center:** The Justice Center was built in 2000 and houses the Leavenworth County Sheriff's Office, Leavenworth (city) Police Department, First District Court (Kansas), Juvenile Detention Center, and all city and county judicial offices.

**County Annex Building:** Leavenworth County operates an Annex Building located on U.S. 24/40 in Tonganoxie in order to better serve Leavenworth County residents who live in the southwest region of the county. There are limited services provided to the public through the Annex. The facility also houses an Emergency Medical Services unit and a Sheriff's Office substation.
County Facilities and Services

**Capital Improvements:** The county maintains a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) through the Public Works Department to meet demand for services, as the county’s population grows. The CIP funds are used by the county to invest in public roads, bridges, and limited stormwater projects in the public right-of-way.

**Sheriff’s Office:** The Leavenworth County Sheriff’s Office serves the county by maintaining peace and security through law enforcement services. The department maintains three bureaus: Operations, Administrative, and Detention.

**Water Services:** Water is a vital utility that needs to be available to all residents. Leavenworth, Lansing, and Tonganoxie all maintain a water department for their residents and a limited service surrounding their jurisdiction. For residents who do not live in the municipal service areas, they connect to one of several Rural Water Districts (RWD) if they do not have access to a well on their property. According to the Kansas Rural Water Association, multiple RWDs serve Leavenworth County, including those discussed in the Utilities subsection of this section.

**Fire Protection:** Residents must also count on fire protection services in order to protect their family and property from danger. Leavenworth County has 12 fire departments that provide emergency response to the residents of their districts. The county does not have an official fire department, but instead allows the residents to create and maintain a number of volunteer fire departments as needed.

**Emergency Medical Services (EMS):** Leavenworth County is served by an EMS department whose mission is to provide quality, responsive, and cost effective pre-hospital advanced life support care and transport to Leavenworth County citizens. The Leavenworth County EMS was established in 1976 by a voter referendum, which granted the county rights to own, operate, and collect taxes, from county residences, to provide an emergency medical service. EMS is a department within county government and provides services to the entire county.

**Schools:** There are six different school districts within Leavenworth County, including:
- Basehor-Linwood Unified School District
- Easton Unified School District
- Fort Leavenworth Unified School District
- Lansing Unified School District
- Leavenworth Unified School District
- Tonganoxie Unified School District

These school districts operate 25 different schools and serve the estimated 14,000 students in Leavenworth County. There are also a number of private schools that operate within Leavenworth County.
- Xavier Catholic School operates in the City of Leavenworth and offers classes for children ages kindergarten through eighth grade.
- St. Paul Lutheran School operates in the City of Leavenworth and offers classes for children ages kindergarten through eighth grade.
Transportation

The transportation network for Leavenworth County consists of a range of roadways that span from controlled access interstates to low-volume dirt roads and major railroads. The rolling terrain of the county, combined with the presence of the Missouri River on the eastern limit of the county and the Kansas River on the southern limit, and the built restrictions of I-70 and railroads, creates a rural county grid network that is often disjointed, unlike many counties in Kansas located further to the west. The transportation network within the county is provided by Leavenworth County, as well as by KTA, KDOT, local municipalities, the Union Pacific Railroad, and BNSF Railway.

Interstates
I-70, which is operated by KTA, crosses the south portion of Leavenworth County. This limited-access toll road has one interchange within Leavenworth County at 222nd Street, located several miles south of the City of Tonganoxie.

Highways
KDOT maintains several U.S. and state highways throughout Leavenworth County. Many of these facilities share multiple designations of both U.S., state, and even city streets. The KDOT facilities, and their state classification, are briefly described below. It should be noted that KDOT roadway classifications do not necessarily correspond to the county’s roadway classification.

- **U.S. Route 73 (U.S. 73)/K-7**: Designated as a Principal Arterial by KDOT, this route runs primarily north and south through Leavenworth County. Starting in the City of Leavenworth and continuing south, this route is a multilane roadway that ultimately provides access to I-70, and the cities of Bonner Springs, Lenexa, and Olathe, Kansas.
- **U.S. 24/U.S. 40**: Designated as a Minor Arterial by KDOT, this route runs primarily east and west through the county and Tonganoxie.
- **Kansas Highway 92 (K-92)**: Designated a Major Collector by KDOT, this route runs primarily east and west through the county through the City of Leavenworth and provides access over the Missouri River.
- **Kansas Highway 192 (K-192)**: Designated a Minor Arterial by KDOT, this east and west route provides access to Easton to U.S. 73/K-7.
- **Kansas Highway 16 (K-16)**: Designated a Minor Arterial by KDOT, this route extends west from Tonganoxie.
- **K-32**: Designated a Minor Arterial by KDOT, this route runs primarily east and west through the southern portions of Leavenworth County.

River Crossings
The K-92/Centennial Bridge crossing is the only crossing of the Missouri River in Leavenworth County. To the south there are two crossings of the Kansas River: on 166th Street providing connection to DeSoto; and on 222nd Street providing access to Eudora.

County Road Classifications
The county roadways, located outside of municipal jurisdictions, have been previously classified and are shown on Figure 2.4. These roads are primarily two-lane facilities with narrow right-of-way measuring 40 feet in width. The roadways are classified as the following:

- **Arterials**: These roadways are higher-capacity roadways whose primary focus is to provide connection between communities and to higher classified state facilities (interstates and major highways/expressways). These are typically paved roadways.
- **Collectors**: These roadways are often lower-capacity facilities that provide access from local roadways and properties to arterials. These roadways can be either paved or gravel roadways.
- **Local Roadways**: These facilities primarily serve adjacent land and development only with the highest amount of access and generally represent the lowest volume roadways in the county. These facilities can be paved, gravel, or even dirt roads.
- **Subdivision Roadways**: These facilities are roadways within a platted subdivision.
- **Private Roadways**: These facilities are owned and maintained by a private individual, organization, or company, rather than by a government. Unauthorized use may be considered trespassing.

As described, the surface treatment for county roadways may be paved, gravel, or dirt roadways. The various surface treatments that exist currently in Leavenworth County are shown on Figure 2.5.
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Existing Road Surfaces
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Pedestrian, Bicyclist, and Transit User Facilities

Although surface roads providing service to motorists are often the most utilized and discussed transportation method – especially at the county-wide scale – there are other forms of transportation that are pertinent to consider. These additional transportation modes include bicycling, walking, and using transit.

Pedestrian and Bicyclist Facilities: As shown on Figure 2.6, most of the county is a bicycle and pedestrian facility desert. The cities of Tonganoxie and Basehor have existing shared use paths, although in each city they are concentrated to one area. The City of Leavenworth has the most robust bicycle and pedestrian network, with existing shared use paths, shared lane markings, and some trails dispersed throughout city limits.

Figure 2.6 also illustrates planned trails, which would address the lack of facilities countywide, while providing linkages to existing options within each city. This planned trail system is part of MARC’s MetroGreen Regional Greenway System, which is part of a larger effort to incorporate more passive and active recreation facilities to relieve congestion and provide more travel mode options.

The definition of each pedestrian, bicyclist, or recreational facility is provided below:

- **Outdoor Recreation Facility:** Facility for biking, boating, hiking, swimming, etc.
- **Sport Facility:** Courts and fields for basketball, baseball, football, volleyball, golf, tennis, etc.
- **Existing Shared Use Path:** Wider sidewalks that support multiple recreation and transportation modes, such as walking, bicycling, or inline skating; typically run parallel to a roadway
- **Existing Marked Share the Road Route:** Shared lane markings and signage denoting a designated bike route; vehicles and bikes ride in the same lane, until it is safe for vehicles to pass the bikes
- **Existing Trail:** Wider paths that support multiple recreation and transportation modes, such as walking or bicycling; typically do not run parallel to a roadway
- **Planned Trail:** Future planned trail, designated in MARC’s MetroGreen Regional Greenway System
- **Planned Bike Route:** Future planned bike route, designated in MARC’s Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan.

Transit User Facilities: The transit system for Leavenworth County was recently studied by KCATA to understand the existing state of transit and the future needs. There are currently no transit routes that operate within Leavenworth County. The closest option is Route 113 (Leavenworth Road), which offers service to and from the Legends Outlets and the 47th and State Avenue Park n’ Ride.

Following a public engagement process and stakeholder meetings, a preferred transit strategy for Leavenworth County was formed. In the near term, the most promising strategy to address public transit service needs is within the Leavenworth-Lansing area. It must be noted that Leavenworth County’s Council on Aging, supported through tax dollars and an arm of the county government, currently provides meals and transportation to seniors within the county.
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Environmental Features

The natural features present within Leavenworth County are illustrated in Figure 2.7, the most prominent of which is the floodway and floodplain stretching north and south across the length of the county. The following subsections detail the current state of each environmental feature present and how they interact with and influence Leavenworth County.

Floodplain
A 100-year floodplain is present along all the major waterways of the county, including: Three, Five, Seven, and Nine Mile Creeks; Stranger Creek; Tonganoxie Creek; and the Kansas and Missouri Rivers. The tributaries of each of these primary waterways also have associated floodplains. Floodways run within the Kansas and Missouri Rivers, as well as Stranger Creek, aiding during flood events to mitigate water damage.

Historically, Leavenworth County has been subject to severe floods, most notably in 1993 when the Missouri River crested to a peak of 35.4 feet. Nearly 20 years later, Leavenworth County experienced another notable flood event when the Missouri River crested close to 30 feet. The most impacted areas from both the 1993 and 2011 flood events included Fort Leavenworth, and the cities of Leavenworth and Lansing. More recently, all of Leavenworth County experienced flooding in 2019 when heavy rainfall flooded both the Missouri River and Stranger Creek.

Floodplain vs. Floodway
The 100-year floodplain is the land area covered by the floodwaters of the 100-year flood. The 100-year flood has a one percent chance of annual occurrence and is the standard for requiring the purchase of flood insurance and regulating development in flood prone areas.

The floodway is the channel of the waterbody and adjacent land that cannot be developed and must be free of obstructions to ensure the 100-year floodwaters can be conveyed downstream.
Environmental Features

Figure 2.7

Data Sources: Leavenworth County, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and Ochsner Hare & Hare, the Olsson Studio
**Watersheds**

A watershed is an area of land that drains to a common body of water, including nearby creeks, streams, rivers, or lakes. Watersheds are sometimes referred to as drainage basins or catchments and are determined based on topography. Watersheds impact the water quality in the water body(ies) that it surrounds because the water picks up debris and other contaminants from urban areas as it drains into the water system.

With an abundance of water resources countywide, Leavenworth County lies within several watersheds, as described below.

- **Stranger Creek**: Much of the Stranger Creek watershed lies within Leavenworth County, flowing through Basehor, Easton, and Linwood. The watershed covers 232,869 acres, covering the western, central, and southern parts of Leavenworth County.
- **Headwaters Stranger Creek**: Located north of the Stranger Creek watershed, Headwaters Stranger Creek covers the northwestern portion of Leavenworth County.
- **Salt Creek**: This watershed includes the northeastern part of Leavenworth County, namely Fort Leavenworth. It spans an area of 28,834 acres and covers a portion of the Missouri River.
- **Fivemile Creek**: Fivemile Creek watershed covers parts of Leavenworth County, and the Cities of Lansing and Leavenworth. It covers an area of 5,945 acres, also including a segment of the Missouri River.
- **Brush Creek**: Covering the southeastern portion of Leavenworth County, the Brush Creek watershed spans 13,504 acres. This watershed also encompasses a portion of the Missouri River.
- **Kansas River**: This watershed is the largest of any watershed that includes Leavenworth County, covering an area of 311,187 acres, although only within a southeastern sliver of the county.

**Waterbodies and Wetlands**

As mentioned previously, there are several prominent water features in Leavenworth County, including: Three, Five, Seven, and Nine Mile Creeks; Stranger Creek; Tonganoxie Creek; and the Kansas and Missouri Rivers. A brief description of each waterbody and where they flow is provided as follows:

- Three, Five, and Seven Mile Creek are all concentrated in the eastern portion of Leavenworth County and flow east before merging with the Missouri River.
- Nine Mile Creek spans the southern half of Leavenworth County, flowing south toward the Kansas River. Another Nine Mile Creek flows through and towards the Kansas River.
- Tonganoxie Creek flows south through the City of Tonganoxie before flowing east to meet Stranger Creek.
- Stranger Creek spans the entire length of the county from north to south, ultimately merging with the Kansas River on the southern border of Leavenworth County.
- The Kansas and Missouri Rivers effectively define the southern and eastern boundaries of the county and represent the largest water systems that interact with Leavenworth County.

In addition to these streams, creeks, and rivers, there are waterbodies, including ponds, dispersed countywide. Wetlands often accompany these water bodies and flowing features as these two environmental features share many traits. Wetlands are concentrated along the Missouri and Kansas Rivers, however area also found dispersed throughout the county. Along the Missouri and Kansas Rivers, the wetland types include freshwater forested/shrub wetland and freshwater emergent wetland.

**Freshwater Emergent Wetlands vs. Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland**

Freshwater emergent wetlands are characterized by erect, rooted, herbaceous water-loving plants, excluding mosses and lichens. This vegetation is present for much of the growing season, most years. Generally, this wetland type is dominated by perennial plants, maintaining a similar appearance year after year.

Freshwater forested/shrub wetlands are characterized as a forested swamp. Considered a woody wetland, surface water is present only for brief periods during the growing season.
Soil

Leavenworth County is agriculturally rich, as illustrated by the soil types on Figure 2.8. Prime Farmland is concentrated primarily around water features as flowing water bodies and wetlands lend themselves to adding high quality nutrients to nearby soils. Unsurprisingly, Prime Farmland if Drained is also found adjacent to water features; however, is concentrated more so along major water routes, namely Stranger Creek and the Missouri River. Dispersed throughout the rest of the county are Farmlands of Statewide Importance.
Utilities

To ensure the proper infrastructure for future development or redevelopment, it is necessary to review the existing utility infrastructure within the county, as shown in Figure 2.9.

Stormwater
Stormwater runoff is generated from rain and snowmelt events that flow over land and are conveyed to downstream waterbodies. In urban areas, impervious surfaces, such as paved streets, parking lots, and building rooftops, generate large amounts of stormwater runoff that is collected in underground collection systems and swiftly conveyed downstream. In rural areas, stormwater runoff generally flows over pervious ground and is partially intercepted by forested areas and infiltrated into the undisturbed soil, generating less runoff than urban areas.

Urbanization has changed land uses across the county and is proceeding at a rapid pace. The creation of impervious surfaces profoundly affects how water moves following storm events, the amount of runoff generated, and quality of water that is conveyed downstream. Stormwater systems, broadly defined as the highest point in the watershed that generates stormwater runoff to the downstream receiving waterbody, require management to plan for stormwater runoff and protect natural resources. Management of these systems is challenged by local jurisdictional boundaries that do not align with watershed boundaries, requiring larger entities, such as counties, to coordinate efforts (e.g., flood damage mitigation and reduction, water quality protection and improvement, and infrastructure maintenance and replacement).

Leavenworth County is situated uniquely between two major rivers. The county is primarily located in the Kansas-Lower Republican River watershed, except for the northeast corner that drains north and east to the Missouri River. These two major watersheds can be further subdivided into smaller watersheds (or subwatersheds) that drain toward the Missouri River, as previously discussed.

Portions of the county’s watersheds have had flood risk mapped through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program. The predominant existing land use in Leavenworth County is agricultural, at approximately 43 percent of the total county area. While agricultural land use tends to produce less runoff when compared to commercial or residential land use, ongoing development in Leavenworth County will produce increased levels of runoff requiring updates to define areas at risk of flooding.

The Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) has identified several streams, including Stranger Creek, within Leavenworth County with a high level of pollutants from both point (attributable to a single source) and non-point (not attributable to a single source) sources contributing to poor water quality. Ongoing monitoring and data analysis efforts will better define the water impairments and solutions to be brought forth to improve water quality.

The extents, adequacy, age, and condition of stormwater infrastructure with Leavenworth County is relatively unknown; a countywide or watershedwide inventory of infrastructure is not available. Such an inventory and condition assessment would assist the county in planning for maintenance, future development, and eventual replacement of the infrastructure, as will be discussed further in Section 7 - Community Facilities and Infrastructure Plan. Tools such as a Geographic Information System (GIS) database can be used to collect data and store information to be used as part of the county’s asset management system.

Infrastructure that is not maintained and replaced as it reaches the end of its design-life can contribute to poor collection and conveyance of stormwater runoff, increased flood risk, and can pose a safety hazard to the public. Examples of safety risk can include bridge and culvert collapses and flooding of upstream buildings.
Figure 2.9

Existing Utilities

Data Sources: Leavenworth County and Ochsner Hare & Hare, the Olsson Studio
Water

For Leavenworth County, water providers in the form of RWDs are present within the unincorporated areas and cover most of the county. In general, the RWDs’ distribution system are within private utility easements held by the utility, public utility easements, and public rights-of-way.

Water systems that consist of more than 10 service connections or regularly serve more than 25 individuals every day are considered public water systems. Such systems are regulated by KDHE.

For smaller systems (residential and commercial), Leavenworth County has developed and adopted the Leavenworth County Sanitary Code. This code establishes a number of items including: administration of the system, permits, licenses, inspections, investigations, enforcement proceedings, appeals, violations, and penalties. Chapter five of the code covers water supply regulations, the key item of which is the different types of service and the associated options:

- For residential tracts of land five acres or greater, the domestic water can be obtained from a well. For tracts of land less than five acres, the water must be supplied by a public water supply.
- For commercial tracts, the preferred source is a public system, however if a tract of land is 10 acres or greater, the system must meet state regulations. For tracts of land less than 10 acres, the water must be treated, and processed supply must be used.

For most of the unincorporated area of the county, water is available or supplied by RWD. Thirteen RWDs are within the county, including:

- Atchison Co. RWD #06 – AT-06
- Consolidated Water District #1
- Jefferson Co. RWD #12 – JF-12
- Jefferson Co. RWD #13 – JF-13
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #01 – LV-01
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #01C – LV-01C
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #02 – LV-02
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #05 – LV-05
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #06 – LV-06
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #07 – LV-07
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #08 – LV-08
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #09 – LV-09
- Leavenworth Co. RWD #10 – LV-10

These RWDs utilize several options to obtain water for their system, including their own production and purchasing water from other public supply sources.

There are also six other public water supply systems, including:

- Leavenworth Waterworks
- Fort Leavenworth
- Tonganoxie - city-owned and operated
- Linwood - city-owned and operated
- Lan-Del Water District
- Suburban Water Service

Typically, the goal of a RWD is to only supply potable water for consumption within their service area. They do not strive to supply water for fire protection, as is the case for water systems inside incorporated areas.

Wastewater

For most of the unincorporated areas of the county, the sanitary sewer system consists of individual on-site treatment systems. At the state level, these systems are regulated by KDHE. Additionally, the county has developed and adopted the Leavenworth County Sanitary Code. This code establishes a number of items including: administration of the system, permits, licenses, inspections, investigations, enforcement proceedings, appeals, violations, and penalties. Chapter two of the code covers regulation of public sewage disposal systems and private sewage disposal systems. Chapter two also covers the following components of these systems: septic tanks, aerobic disposal systems, mound systems, privies, holding tanks, and other systems, as well as regulations for installers, disposal contractors, and designers.

Chapter three addresses regulations for public and/or community sewage systems for larger developments and a higher density of residences (lots less than two-and-one-half acres).

Solid Waste

The final piece of the regulation associated with sanitary sewer is chapter six, which regulates septic waste haulers. For the incorporated areas, a sanitary sewer collection system and treatment system exists that is regulated by KDHE.
Power

Electrical providers are present within the unincorporated county, but the county does not operate these utilities. The county does routinely coordinate capital improvement projects with the providers regarding utility relocations. Providers are primarily regulated by the Kansas Corporation Commission or by state statute. In general, providers are physically located within private utility easements held by the individual provider, public utility easements, and public rights-of-way to provide necessary services.

Unincorporated Leavenworth County is served by two providers: Freestate Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Evergy. In 2018, Kansas City Power and Light and Westar Energy, Inc. merged to form Evergy. The merger was completed by the end of 2019. Commonly, distribution for electrical power can be via transmission lines, utility poles, and underground conduit. Power providers are discussed in detail below.

Freestate Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Freestate): Freestate generally provides service in the central and western areas of the county. Freestate’s infrastructure currently meets the needs of the county and the company performs regular upgrades and maintenance to their infrastructure. Freestate utilizes a capital improvement program to plan for growth in their service territory and recognizes future growth within the county.

No major infrastructure improvements are planned for the utility in the short- or long-term within the county. Freestate has not reported any trending issues when providing new service due to growth, nor do they have any current concerns when working with the different jurisdictions regarding public improvement projects that may require relocation efforts to existing infrastructure.

Evergy: Evergy generally provides services for the central, southern, and eastern regions of the county. Evergy’s infrastructure currently meets the needs of the county. Evergy performs routine inspections on all its infrastructure to identify maintenance needs and utilizes a long-term electrical load forecast. As electrical load increases, capital improvement plans are developed for new/updated infrastructure to increase capacity.

No major infrastructure improvements are planned for the utility in the short- or long-term within the unincorporated county, nor are there any trending issues when providing new service due to growth.

Natural Gas

Atmos Energy and Kansas Gas Service are the two natural gas providers within the county. Atmos Energy serves the majority of the county except for a portion in the northeast part of the county, where service is provided by Kansas Gas Service. In addition, both Atmos Energy and Kansas Gas Service share a common band within the county located from the southwest corner of the county to the northeast corner of the county, which is approximately three miles wide. Atmos Energy and Kansas Gas Service distribute gas through an existing underground pipe system. Some clients in rural areas may not be served by the providers’ distribution infrastructure. Such residents and businesses utilize on-site natural gas tanks.

Providers are described in more detail below.

Atmos Energy: Atmos Energy reports that their current infrastructure meets the present needs of the county and is in good condition. Atmos Energy does have a master replacement plan for the entire state of Kansas, which is updated on a regular basis. Upcoming projects within the county are planned, but will be limited in scope. Long term, most of the steel mains and vintage plastic mains will be replaced. The schedule of existing infrastructure replacement is subject to change with ongoing routine inspections. When opportunities for growth are presented, the provider considers infrastructure investment on an individual basis.

Kansas Gas Service: Kansas Gas Service reports that their current infrastructure meets the present needs of the county and is in good condition. No short- or long-term infrastructure improvements are planned; Kansas Gas Service does not utilize a master plan. When opportunities for growth are presented, the provider considers infrastructure investment on an individual basis.

Telecommunications

With regard to the county, telecommunications include cable television, internet, and telephone. For the purposes of this subsection, wireless communication was not discussed due the lack of infrastructure in the public right-of-way required for operation.

Telecommunication lines are present underground and aboveground on electric provider utility poles. Improvements that require electrical utility pole relocations commonly impact telecommunication infrastructure. AT&T, Centurylink, and Midco are the primary providers for cable television, internet, and telephone within the county. AT&T is generally in the southwest, central, and northwest portions of the county; Centurylink is generally in the northwest and south portions of the county; and Midco is generally located south of Lansing to south of I-70 and from Tonganoxie to K-7. Midco also services Linwood and the surrounding Linwood area. Providers do routine inspections and maintenance on existing infrastructure and all providers have capacity for new customers.
Demographic and Market Profile

An analysis of Leavenworth County’s demographics and economic and market trends was performed to better understand the existing state of these topics within Leavenworth County, as well as a selection of its neighboring counties. The topics studied include an analysis of the county’s general demographics, employment, housing, retail market, office market, industrial market, and tourism market trends.

This analysis is one part of the preliminary planning process performed to inform future planning discussions and establish the necessary background information to develop market-viable recommendations. Information obtained through the Economic and Market Analysis (see Appendix A) is also folded into this section to provide a comprehensive picture of Leavenworth County’s demographic and market profile.

Trends are discussed using data from the 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census and the 2013-2017 ACS. The 2013-2017 ACS data reflect a five-year estimated average based on surveys conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau during that time. Throughout this section, the 2013-2017 data are labeled as 2017 to not confuse the “2013-2017” with a data trend over time, but rather a specific point in time.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County, KS</td>
<td>68,691</td>
<td>76,227</td>
<td>79,359</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (2000)</td>
<td>23,071</td>
<td>26,447</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (2000)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age (2000)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income (2000)</td>
<td>$71,747*</td>
<td>$85,651*</td>
<td>$72,581*</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County, KS</td>
<td>451,086</td>
<td>544,179</td>
<td>578,797</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (2000)</td>
<td>174,570</td>
<td>212,882</td>
<td>224,248</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (2000)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age (2000)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income (2000)</td>
<td>$91,641*</td>
<td>$85,651*</td>
<td>$84,085*</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wyandotte County, KS</td>
<td>157,882</td>
<td>157,505</td>
<td>163,227</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (2000)</td>
<td>59,700</td>
<td>58,399</td>
<td>59,355</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (2000)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age (2000)</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income (2000)</td>
<td>$50,378*</td>
<td>$44,727*</td>
<td>$44,346*</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platte County, MO</td>
<td>73,781</td>
<td>89,322</td>
<td>96,899</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (2000)</td>
<td>29,278</td>
<td>36,103</td>
<td>38,147</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (2000)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age (2000)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income (2000)</td>
<td>$83,281*</td>
<td>$76,608*</td>
<td>$76,910*</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Median household income figures have been adjusted for inflation (2019).

Demographics

Located at the urban fringe of Kansas City, Leavenworth County’s growth is influenced by trends beyond its borders. As the Kansas City region continues to grow, the county is anticipated to experience accelerated population and job growth, heightened residential and commercial development activity, and increased demands for municipal and transportation services. To provide context, demographic information for Leavenworth County neighbors, Johnson, Wyandotte, and Platte (Missouri) counties, has also been provided.

Population

Like its peer counties, Leavenworth County has experienced population growth, up 15.5 percent since 2000. Population growth has outpaced both the State of Kansas and the U.S., particularly in the 1980s and 2000s. Since 1980, the county has added over 26,500 residents, putting its current population at 79,359 (2017). From 2019 to 2040, Leavenworth County’s population is forecast to increase by over 19,000 residents.
Household Income
Leavenworth County’s median household income well exceeds that for Kansas, with a lower rate of households earning less than $35,000 and a greater rate of high-income households ($75,000 to $199,999). Leavenworth County’s household income levels suggest the ability to support above average retail sales per capita, housing values, and rents. Despite maintaining a higher median household income compared to state and nationwide averages, compared to Johnson and Platte counties, Leavenworth County incomes are lower. Refer to Figure 2.10 for additional information.

Educational Attainment
Above average educational attainment levels create opportunity to generate higher income levels, retail sales, housing values, and professional occupations, all of which translate to above average demand for professional office space. Educational attainment levels for Leavenworth County compare to that for Kansas with 30.9 percent of the population holding a bachelor's degree or higher, compared to 32.3 percent statewide, as seen in Figure 2.11.

Age
Comprising one-fifth of the population, children ages 0-14 are the largest age group in Leavenworth County, as seen in Figure 2.12. Each age group demands different goods, services, housing, and entertainment options. With the generally even age distribution, Leavenworth County must accommodate a wide variety of housing choices, retail services, food and drink establishments, and professional services.
Race and Ethnicity
Alongside the population growth from 2000 to 2017 came changes in the makeup of the county, as referenced in Table 2.3. Specifically, the Asian alone population segment increased nearly 63 percent over this time. Others decreased, including Black or African American (-1.4 percent), American Indian and Alaska Native (-1.2 percent), and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (-59.1 percent). Despite these changes, White alone still comprises most of the population (83.0 percent).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment
This section reviews the major employers in Leavenworth County, the employment rate and its historical fluctuations and projected growth, and the predominant job sectors.

Job Growth Trends and Forecasts
Employment in Leavenworth County has plateaued since 2011, as seen in Figure 2.13, but shows signs of improvement. After peaking in 2007 with 31,086 jobs and an unemployment rate of 5.4 percent, employment hit a low in 2009 when it dipped to 30,100 jobs and experienced a nearly 2.5 percent increase in unemployment (8.0 percent total). The job market has since steadily improved, reaching 35,216 jobs by 2018 and a favorable unemployment rate of 3.6 percent. Leavenworth County is forecast to add approximately 8,500 jobs through 2040.

Figure 2.13
Major County Employers
Fort Leavenworth dominates the employer market with over 8,800 employees, as shown in Table 2.4. This means Fort Leavenworth employs nearly 8,000 more people than the number two largest employer, the Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Center (685 employees).

### Table 2.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Leavenworth</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>8,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Medical Center</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth USD #453</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing Correctional Facility</td>
<td>Lansing, KS</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing USD #469</td>
<td>Lansing, KS</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Administration - CPAC</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Federal Penitentiary</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart Supercenter</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northrup-Grumman</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KS</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment by Sector
The top five leading employment sectors in the county, as shown in Figure 2.14, include:
- Healthcare and Education
- Public Administration
- Retail Trade
- Entertainment, Accommodations, and Food Service
- Finance, Insurance, Real Estate (FIRE) and Information

Conversely, the county lags employment opportunities in manufacturing, professional and business services, and retail trade. As these employment sectors grow, demand for professional and medical office, retail, and industrial space will increase.

![Figure 2.14](chart.png)
This section provides an overview of housing and rental trends in Leavenworth County, diving into owner-versus renter-occupied, housing type and value, and comparisons to statewide trends.

**Housing Stock**
The 2000 Census reported Leavenworth County’s housing stock at 24,401 dwelling units. By 2010, the housing stock increased by 17.6 percent to 28,697 dwelling units. Although more modest than the growth from 2000 to 2010, housing stock grew in 2018 to a total of 29,991 dwelling units.

Of the current housing stock, detached single-family homes account for the majority, capturing nearly 80.0 percent of the share, while multi-family housing options comprise approximately 12.0 percent, as shown in Figure 2.15. The county’s portion of smaller multi-family housing stock, with two to nine dwelling units, is consistent with statewide averages, while larger properties with 10 or more dwelling units account for just 2.7 percent of the inventory (compared to 8.3 percent statewide).

**Apartment Stock**
Over the past decade, there have been no new, large-scale (10 or more dwelling units per property) apartment properties constructed countywide. Currently, Leavenworth County has 19 large-scale apartment properties that support 835 dwelling units. From 2010 through 2014, healthy occupancy levels increased rent prices 8.0 percent; however, rising vacancy rates weakened the apartment market, ultimately causing a decline in average rent prices by 2015, as seen in Figure 2.16. As the market overall recovered since 2015, rents have once again been on the rise.
Housing Values

While Leavenworth County’s median housing value has remained relatively flat since 2010, it has consistently exceeded the statewide median, as shown in Figure 2.17. In 2017, the median housing value in Leavenworth County was $171,000 compared to $139,200 statewide.

Monthly Rents

Since 2010, rental housing in Leavenworth County has gained market share. From 2010 to 2017, the county’s median monthly rent exceeded the statewide median, increasing 20.9 percent by 2017 ($950 per month), as shown in Figure 2.18. This compared to Kansas’ median rent of $801 per month, which was 15.7 percent below the median for Leavenworth County.

Housing Tenure

In 2010, owner-occupied units accounted for 69.4 percent of all occupied housing units. Comparatively, renter-occupied housing accounted for 30.6 percent of all units. From 2010 to 2017, the inventory of renter-occupied housing increased by ten percent, or 804 units, with the owner-occupied stock increasing just 3.6 percent (651 units). By 2017, rental housing accounted for approximately one-third (32.0 percent) of the housing stock, with owner-occupied slightly reduced to 68.0 percent from 2010 levels.
The City of Leavenworth serves as the county’s principal retail destination. Despite this draw, the county’s retail inventory space makes up just 2.0 percent of space in the Kansas City MSA. Leavenworth County supports 31 square feet of occupied retail space per capita compared to 56 square feet per capita for the Kansas City MSA. Most of the county’s inventory consists of general retail and neighborhood shopping centers.

The retail market in Leavenworth County is trending positively. From a high of 6.7 percent in 2017, the county’s retail vacancy rate has reached a healthy 1.8 percent in response to escalating space absorption. During the first half of 2019, net absorption totaled 96,287 square feet. Over the past five years, the average rental rate for retail space increased by 10.7 percent to $10.78 per square foot. Over the same timeframe, the average retail rent for the Kansas City MSA increased by 12.3 percent to $15.65 per square foot.

**Retail Pull Factor Trends**

Despite supporting a median household income that exceeds the Kansas City MSA rate, Leavenworth County suffers from considerable retail sales leakage. Since 2010, the annual pull factor has remained largely unchanged. The current rate of 0.59 indicates that the county captures retail sales at a rate equal to just 59 percent of the statewide average.

The City of Leavenworth supports a slightly higher pull factor yet still suffers from retail sales leakage. Leavenworth County’s long-standing retail sales leakage is a symptom of its modest population levels, presence at the urban fringe, and proximity to larger and more diverse retail destinations in the Kansas City MSA.

**Pull Factors**

A pull factor is a measure of the strength of a community’s retail trade, based on a comparison of local spending in relation to that of a wider geographic area (e.g., the state), with a measure of 1.0 representing a perfect balance. A pull factor greater than 1.0 indicates that the community is pulling in retail sales from beyond its boundaries and the balance of trade is favorable. Alternatively, a pull factor less than 1.0 indicates that the community is not capturing local shoppers and is experiencing retail sales leakage.
Office Market

The county supports a modest inventory of professional office space, which totals almost one million square feet, or just 0.78 percent of the Kansas City MSA inventory. Class A space totals just 109,911 square feet, operating at an average rent of $24.04 per square foot with no vacancies currently.

Since 2015, Leavenworth County has absorbed 116,175 square feet of net office space with no new construction reported. As a result of these market dynamics, the overall vacancy rate has gradually improved from 15.1 percent (2015) to 9.7 percent (second quarter of 2019). By comparison, the Kansas City MSA office market is currently operating at a vacancy rate of 6.6 percent. No new office space is currently under construction within Leavenworth County. Vacancies are forecast to remain stable over the next several years.

Class A Office Space

The Building Owners and Managers Association classifies office space into three categories: Class A, Class B, and Class C. Class A office buildings have the “most prestigious buildings competing for premier office users with rents above average for the area”. Class A facilities have “high quality standard finishes, state of the art systems, exceptional accessibility, and a definite market presence.”

Office Market Trends / Net Absorption and Vacancies

Figure 2.20
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**Industrial Market**

The inventory of industrial space totals 4.2 million square feet, of which 3.6 million square feet is warehouse space. Since 2015, the county has absorbed one-half million square feet of industrial space with a total new supply limited to just 81,000 square feet. With such limited supply of new industrial space, the vacancy rate has been less than one percent since 2016.

Adding to this trend, the average rental rate for industrial space has increased by 6.6 percent to $4.72 per square foot since 2015. During the same time, the average industrial rent for the Kansas City MSA increased by 6.9 percent to $5.29 per square foot.

**Tourism Market**

Tourism expenditures in Leavenworth County increased 36.7 percent from 2013 to 2017, reaching $58.6 million. In 2017, tourism expenditures were led by transportation ($19.7 million), followed by food and beverage ($17.0 million), and retail ($7.77 million), as illustrated in Figure 2.22. As a result of growing tourism expenditures, tourism-related employment increased from 720 jobs (2013) to 884 jobs (2017).
Section 3
Community Engagement

Community engagement is the true lifeblood of the planning process; without it, the Plan may not reflect the needs, wants, and desires of those directly impacted by the Plan. At its most basic level, community engagement is a conversation between one group of people that has the technical knowledge to help problem solve and another group of people that has the on-the-ground, real world knowledge of a place. The conversation must be collaborative in nature, engaging, personal, and involve much listening. In the end, a strong plan is developed with the community, not just for it. As a blueprint for the county’s future, it was critical that as many county residents and users were involved in the development of the Plan as possible. Through multi-phased engagement efforts, involved collaboration with the community took place to discuss the ideas and priorities that became the recommendations put forth in this Plan. The following section summarizes both that process and its outcomes.

Each engagement activity provided attendees with the opportunity to share their desires for the future of the county. After each activity, comments and conversations that took place were documented and analyzed for incorporation into concepts. This information then shaped and reshaped priorities and recommendations. The entire community engagement process is described in Appendix B Community Engagement Summary.

Two committees were formed for the community engagement process: the Stakeholder and Citizen Advisory Committee (SCAC) and the Technical Committee (TC). The SCAC was made up of county property owners, business owners, and other key stakeholders who have a vested interest in the future of Leavenworth County. Membership on the SCAC was open to any Leavenworth County resident interested in serving in such a capacity. The TC was made up of representatives from various county agencies that would, in part, be responsible for implementing portions of the Plan.
Online Engagement

Website

A website (www.lvcountyplan.com) was created to provide a landing page for anyone interested in learning about the planning process.

The website provides information on a variety of topics related to the Plan, including:

- A project overview, which details the purpose of the Plan and the goals of the planning process;
- A project timeline that shows the phases of the project;
- A listing of the different ways to engage in the planning process as a member of the public, or as a member of the SCAC or TC (e.g., public survey, focus groups, charrette, and/or public open houses);
- Project downloadables that summarize findings and/or engagement events; and
- An opportunity to ask questions or provide comments to the county.

A “lightbox” also opens within a few seconds of opening the website, asking if the viewer would like to be added to the contact list to receive project communications throughout the lifetime of the project. Various e-blasts was sent to those who opted in to email notification about the project to advertise and invite people to the public open houses.

Additionally, the website included a form to allow those interested to sign up for specific focus groups and to be a member of the SCAC.

Social Media

Facebook (www.facebook.com/lvcountyplan) was used to inform people about the comprehensive plan process, solicit participation in all events, and invite residents to take the online survey. Between May and September of 2019, the project’s Facebook content reached more than 26,000 unique people, for a total of 255,000 impressions.
As part of the community engagement process, 2,124 people took a public survey. The following text is a summary of the survey’s findings; the complete survey analysis is available in Appendix B.

Respondent Demographics
Survey respondents were analyzed by age, gender, employment status, and what their connection was to Leavenworth County:

- Nearly all respondents (97%) said they live in the county, with another 23.2 percent reporting they work in the county.
- The largest age groups of respondents were in their 40s and 50s, with smaller age cohorts older and younger.
- Women outnumbered men (53.2% compared to 41.9%), which is typical for online surveys.
- By and large, participants who took this survey were either employed (68.4%) or retired (23.3%).
- More than half (54.6%) of the respondents have lived in the county 20+ years, with another 20.5 percent reporting they have lived in the county 10-19 years.

Where Respondents Live
The survey asked respondents to identify whether they lived in a city, in an urban growth area, or in a rural, unincorporated area of the county. For those who said they lived in a city or urban growth area, respondents were asked which city they live in or near. A brief summary of such findings follows.

- People who live within the city limits of an incorporated city made up 41.6 percent of respondents. Those living in an urban growth area were another 29.9 percent, and 27.3 percent live in rural, unincorporated areas.
- Leavenworth, Lansing, and Tonganoxie had more respondents who live within the city limits than in the urban growth area; Basehor, Linwood, Bonner Springs, and Easton had more respondents in the urban growth area than living inside the city limits.
- Cities had the most statistically diverse residents, in terms of age, with the largest percentage of respondents under 40 living in cities. Those in their 40s and 50s were most likely to live in the urban growth area than those older or younger, and those in their 50s and 60s were the most likely to live in rural, unincorporated areas. People in their 70s and 80s were more likely to live inside a city than in the other two locations.
- People who have lived in the county for three years or fewer were the most likely to live within the limits of a city (58.5%), while those who have lived in the county 20+ years were the least likely to live in a city (37.3%).
- New residents to the county (three years or fewer) were most likely to live in Basehor (44.7%). Of those who have lived in the county 20+ years, Leavenworth had the largest share at 33.1 percent, with Basehor at 27.7 percent and Lansing at 19.5 percent.
Why Residents Live in Leavenworth County

By far, the most common reason why people choose to live in Leavenworth County is the county’s rural atmosphere (69.3%). Other top responses included to be close to family (52.2%) and proximity to Kansas City (50.5%).

By age, those 29 and younger chose to be close to family in largest numbers (70.1%), while all other age cohorts chose rural atmosphere as their top reason.

When analyzed by length of residency, rural atmosphere was the most common reason for all groups. However, for those who have moved to the county at some point in the past two decades, cost of living was much more likely to be a top-three reason, while it was not a top-three reason for those who have lived in the county 20+ years.

Controlling Growth

When asked where in the county growth should occur, most respondents chose within cities (63.1%), with on the edge of existing cities the second most common answer at 41.9 percent. In distant third was a tie between undeveloped rural areas and I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County at 11 percent.

Respondents were also asked about growth in unincorporated areas of the county and specifically whether the county should control where new development occurs. Slightly more than half of respondents selected yes, with 28.7 percent choosing no and 20.7 percent not sure. The rate of response was similar by city.

However, when examined by age, younger residents were less likely to believe that Leavenworth County should control where growth occurs than older residents were. The oldest two age groups (70s and 80+) had the highest rate of people who believed the county government should control where growth occurs, with 61.9 percent of those in their 70s and 73.9 percent of those 80+ choosing yes.

When asked if the county should control what type of new development occurs in unincorporated areas of the county, nearly 60 percent of respondents chose yes (58.2%), with 25.6 percent choosing no and 16.3 percent not sure. Most of the answers on this question were fairly consistent; however, older respondents are more likely to believe the county should be able to control what type of development occurs.
Types of New Development

The most popular choice for types of new, desired development in nearly every group was outdoor recreation spaces, defined as athletic fields, parks, playgrounds, trails, open spaces, etc. Overall, 60.2 percent chose this answer, and it was the top choice for people regardless of the location of their residence (within cities, urban growth areas, or rural).

Other popular choices were commercial development, suburban-style, single-family housing developments, agriculture, and mixed-use development. I do not support new development in Leavenworth County received 8.9 percent of the votes.

Outdoor recreation was by far the most common choice of people who live within cities, with Linwood residents choosing it at the highest rate of 71.4 percent.

All age groups also chose outdoor recreation spaces as their top option, except those in their 70s who preferred suburban-style, single-family housing, and commercial development.

Greatest Concerns for the County

Universally, the greatest concern respondents have for the county is the maintenance of existing roads/construction of new roads, with 71.1 percent choosing this from a list of options. Other top concerns included preserving natural areas and wetlands, rapid residential growth in rural areas, lack of commercial development, and lack of parks, trails and outdoor recreation spaces.

All seven cities chose the option about roads most commonly but had some variance between other top choices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid residential growth in rural areas</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving natural areas and wetlands</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of existing roads/construction of new roads</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commercial development (services, retail, manufacturing, entertainment, and dining options)</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private property maintenance</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Locating New Development Near Existing Utility Infrastructure

The large majority — 71.4 percent — chose yes, new developments should be prioritized near existing utility infrastructure. This answer was fairly consistent across all types of areas respondents live in (within cities, urban growth area, or rural). There was some variance by city, with Lansing having the highest percentage of yes responses (80.3%) and Easton the lowest (50%).

When asked who should pay for the cost of extending services such as sewers, water lines, and other utilities to new developments, respondents were clear the county should not bear this cost alone, with only 3.3 percent choosing the county on this question. Some are willing for the county to share costs in some combination with developers (44.9%), but the largest percentage said the developers should be responsible for the costs at 46.5 percent.

When analyzed by what type of location the respondents lived in, those in the cities preferred splitting the cost between the county and the developer (54.4%), while those in urban growth areas and rural areas believed the developer should cover the cost (52.8% and 59.8%, respectively).

Figure 3.4

County Sewer Services

Respondents seemed unsure how to answer the questions about creating a countywide sewer program. Almost the same percentage of respondents chose yes (36.9%) as no (36.5%), and a significant number were not sure (26.6%). Those living in cities were more likely than the other two groups to choose yes (50.8% compared to 29.7% in urban growth areas and 23% in rural areas).

Respondents from Leavenworth, Lansing, and Tonganoxie were the most likely to choose yes, with the highest percentage of no responses coming from Easton, Bonner Springs, and Linwood.

By age, those in their 30s were the most likely to choose yes, while 41.3 percent of those 29 and younger chose no.

Nearly 50 percent of new residents to the county want a county sewer system, while only 33.1 percent of those who have lived in the county 20+ years do.
Design Standards and Building Codes

Three questions dealt with whether homes built outside city limits (in an urban growth area) should have to conform to city design and building standards:

**Should residential subdivisions in unincorporated areas near a city be required to meet design/building codes?**

Most respondents chose yes on this question (57.1%), with 29.5 percent no and 13.4 percent not sure. Those living in cities were the most supportive of this issue, while those in urban growth areas and rural areas answered it about the same (46.2% and 49.8% respectively yes).

The cities most supportive of subdivisions near cities being required to conform to city standards were Tonganoxie, Leavenworth, and Lansing, with Bonner Springs, Basehor, and Linwood being the least supportive.

Older respondents (60+) were more likely to support urban growth areas being required to conform to design/building standards, although younger respondents also supported the idea, just at lower percentages.

**Are you concerned that homes built in unincorporated areas of the county are not built to the same standards as those in cities?**

The majority of respondents selected no at 58.7 percent. The gap between yes and no responses was less when looking at only those living in cities (42.5% no compared to 39.7% yes). Urban growth area and rural respondents responded no in larger and similar numbers — 70.5 percent of urban growth area and 73 percent of rural.

Cities in the more rural parts of the county — Basehor, Linwood, Easton, and Bonner Springs — were more likely to choose no on this question. The largest yes percent ages were from Lansing, Leavenworth, and Tonganoxie.

By age, the youngest participants were least likely to choose yes. Those most concerned were 60+.

**Should Leavenworth county adopt building codes?**

The majority of people chose yes at 50.5 percent; however, when analyzed by group, this is not a clear-cut decision. No responses were about one-third of the responses (33.3%) and the not sure responses were at 16.2 percent. It appears the county is divided on this issue.

Those in the cities were more likely to choose yes at 68.6 percent, while those who live in rural areas were at 34.9 percent yes. Specific cities in favor of building codes were Leavenworth, Lansing, Tonganoxie, Basehor, and Bonner Springs. The largest no responses came from Linwood and Easton.

Older residents were much more likely to support building codes than younger residents were, with those 60+ choosing yes at rates 62.4 percent and higher, while those 59 and younger responded yes at rates in the 43 percent to 48 percent range.

New residents who have lived in the county three years or fewer were the most likely to want building codes, with 57.6 percent choosing yes. However, there was little variance between the highest and lowest percentages on this question, indicating general agreement by length of residence. Respondents who have lived in the county seven years or more answered yes at rates between 47.9 percent and 49.1 percent.
In-Person Engagement

**Visioning Workshop**

**Purpose**
Before a comprehensive plan can be crafted, a vision must be collectively formed. The vision sets the tone for the remainder of the planning process, offering a sturdy foundation of which the rest of the Plan can be based upon. The exercise of gathering stakeholders, community members, and city/county staff members to determine what the future should hold establishes a mutual direction for the Plan, builds trust amongst all parties, and defines the purpose for the effort at-hand.

This is why visioning serves as a critical milestone in the planning process. Not only is it the first in-person engagement opportunity, it is the time when needs, wants, and desires are expressed and the "ifs," "buts," and "hows" are ignored – at least for the time being. The visioning workshop is a time to dream and let go of the price tag and time constraints. The vision can only be uncovered when the concerns are discarded such that they do not cloud the results.

---

**Visioning Workshop Agenda**

**Introduction**
- Who we are (consultant team)
- Overview of Comprehensive Plan
- Project schedule

**Setting the Table**
- Preliminary existing conditions
- Pep talk

**Defining Success Exercises**
- Word cloud
- Needs, wants, and desires
- Impediments, obstacles, and dislikes

**Wrap-Up**
- Upcoming events
**Process**

The visioning workshop was a critical time for the planning team to listen intently to what county residents envision for Leavenworth County in the future and what they hope to achieve from this project. This dialogue was facilitated through a variety of exercises that helped the SCAC and TC put their ideas into words.

In preparation for the visioning workshop, the planning team prepared select maps to illustrate the existing conditions throughout the county, created a project website (www.lvcountyplan.com), and visited the county multiple times. These matters were presented to both committees at the visioning workshop, allowing all participants to provide input on and ask questions about these initial findings. This presentation permitted everyone to work from the same base understanding of the current conditions of the county. After presenting this information, the planning team led a series of exercises, described as follows.

**Outcomes**

**Word Clouds:** The first exercise was intentionally simply. It asked participants to describe in one word what made them most proud about Leavenworth County. Responding on sheets of paper, the planning team compiled responses into a word cloud. The larger the word, the more times it was repeated. Trends included appreciation for the county’s rural nature, diversity, and friendly people.

![Word Cloud Image](image-url)
**Needs, Wants, and Desires / Impediments, Obstacles, and Dislikes:** The second exercise asked participants to individually record their (1) needs, wants, and desires and (2) impediments, obstacles, and dislikes for the county, defined as follows:

- **Needs:** We need to address this critical issue.
- **Wants:** If we had the choice, we would choose to have this...
- **Desires:** Wouldn’t it be nice if..., but if we don’t get it, that’s okay.
- **Impediments:** Immovable objects or obstructions that we must go around.
- **Obstacles:** Things that can be surmounted or changed (hopefully in our best interest); get in the way of what we want to accomplish (but not just a nuisance).
- **Dislikes:** Things we just do not like; tend to be nuisances and personal; do not prevent you from achieving your goals.

Once all participants had individually recorded their responses to the prompts, the planning team split everyone up into six randomized groups. Within their groups, participants cycled through each station (six stations total, one for each prompt) to review all responses and simply absorb what others had written.

Once an understanding of what everyone had recorded was established, the groups cycled through each station to pick their top three favorite responses of each category and place those responses on their own group sheet. This exercise began the narrowing process to determine which items were most important. Each group selected a spokesperson to report back their priorities to the larger group.

With group priorities identified, it was time for the planning team to digest and summarize the content of the visioning workshop. Pooling the prioritized responses from each group, a collective list of input for each of the six prompts was created, as illustrated to the right. Note that the lists are not in any sort of prioritized order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Needs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High speed internet in rural areas – not “5G”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved road system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/south major arterials through center and north county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of building codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to major highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve natural beauty and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved utility infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wants</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure agriculture zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pave the roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High speed internet in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better mental health access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New access (e.g., bridge, roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/bike trail systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-planned infrastructure (sewer/water/roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage equality (LGBTQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation plan for 5-, 10-, 20-year growth projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/urban balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally owned businesses, restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good tax base (industrial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Desires</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public areas that leverage the land – camping, fishing, mountain biking, etc.; recreational areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical education center, skilled crafts development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light industry that does not pollute or threaten the county’s beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/south roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/business/retail options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking and biking trails through wooded areas; trails connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM development center for ALL ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High speed internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More options for recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-defined paths of communication (government to citizens, citizens to government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impediments

- Lack of plan
- Lacking industrial tax base
- Do not let the improvements of county be hampered by fiefdoms of the cities/towns
- Leaders with personal agendas rather than community well-being goals
- County zoning as currently written
- Stranger Creek, Stranger Creek bridges, and floodplain
- Poor tax base
- "Keep it the way it is" mentality
- Lack of high paying jobs
- Internet
- Lack of economical development to offset tax base
- Idea that industry is the only type of economic development we can have
- Military fort and prisons (take away some revenue, but use roads, pay no taxes, etc.)
- Climate change
- Egos

Obstacles

- 12 stoplights along Highway 7
- "Good old boy" network
- Public transportation
- Lack of sewer/water infrastructure
- County administrative/staff adverse to working with cities
- Money
- Poor infrastructure standards
- Short-sighted tax policy
- Lack of high speed internet in rural areas
- Roads/terrain
- Lack of forward thinking
- City/county divided interests
- Small tax base
- Cost of infrastructure (water, sewer, roads)
- Metro access, river crossing
- Differing opinions on what is needed

Dislikes

- History of things happening without community input
- Incomplete business plans released (or not) to public
- Allowing developers to buy parcels outside city limits in rural areas and expecting to build high density communities
- Subdivisions in rural areas
- That cities have been given power to impose control over property owners 3 miles outside city limits without permission of land owners
- Commercial within 25-feet of residential development (in county)
- Bureaucracy
- Too many water districts
- This is people thing – lots of real provincialism, inability to cooperate among entities
- Lack of consideration for property owners’ rights
- Lack of vision
- Lack of code enforcement
- Secret deals with developers
- Leavenworth County Planning and Zoning notification process
- Lack of infrastructure in rural developments; awkward land use when all development follows the road sides
- Planning and Zoning tells you a policy and then you see others not following; inconsistent
- Friction between cities and county
- Too much commercial/industrial property in rural areas
Focus Groups

Overview
Ten focus groups were conducted in June 2019. Groups were organized into five primary topics, and all related to different aspects of population growth in the county. Each of the five topics was offered in the north (Easton) and south (Tonganoxie) part of the county. The topics were:
- Land Use/Zoning
- Infrastructure
- Agriculture
- Urban Growth
- Economic Development

Participant Demographics
The focus group participants can be described as follows.
- 101 participants and 54 unique participants, with 27 people attending more than one group. Four people attended all five groups in their area.
- 33 participants in the north sessions, 68 in the south.
- 64 percent of participants had lived in Leavenworth County for 20+ years.
- 56 percent of participants lived in unincorporated areas.
- Tonganoxie was the most represented city. Cities also represented in the focus groups were: Leavenworth, Lansing, Basehor, Linwood, Easton, and Kansas City.
- Attendees were 68 percent male and 32 percent female.

Discussion:
- The general consensus seemed to be that there is the most potential for growth within existing cities like Leavenworth, where density could be increased and older buildings could be renovated and repurposed. Many participants saw a lot of potential in downtown Leavenworth for new businesses to open and more housing to be built.
- After that would come growth on the edge of existing cities; however, some people were against that as well, believing the sole focus should be within the existing cities.
- Commercial growth should be limited to where it is being specifically targeted and where it makes sense, such as along County Road 1. Many people worried that the rural areas cannot handle the traffic and infrastructure needs that come with commercial locating out in those areas.
- As far as growth out in the rural areas, people seemed to understand that one of the ways in which Leavenworth County is growing is through land being split up into 2.5- or 5-acre lots, where people from the city are moving to enjoy a rural atmosphere and scenic countryside. Infrastructure seemed to be the main issue participants had with new growth being located in rural areas. They felt cities are already prepared to handle these needs. Paved roads, sewers, fire protection, water lines, increased traffic, etc., all disrupt rural life and can cause an increase in taxes.

Perceptions of County Growth
Overview:
- Most groups agreed that growth was inevitable, so it needs to be controlled.
- As it is the oldest county in the state, some people were happy to see others moving to Leavenworth County and recognizing what is great about living there.
- The most common advantage to growth mentioned was that it would potentially decrease property taxes by spreading expenses among more residents.
- Northern groups were generally concerned about how growth could contribute to the loss of agricultural land, an increase in traffic on gravel roads, and loss of the natural beauty of the county due to views being obstructed by more housing.
- More of the southern participants had lived in Leavenworth County fewer than 10 years (22%), and saw themselves as part of the growth. The northern participants were more likely to be long-time residents (79% had been residents for more than 20 years), and some had family farms in the county for generations.

Preferred Locations for Future Development

![Figure 3.8 Preferred Locations for Future Development](image)

- Within cities: 35.3%
- On the edge of existing cities: 44.2%
- Along County Road 1: 12.2%
- Undeveloped rural areas: 2.6%
- Not sure: 4.5%
- I do not want to see growth in the county: 1.3%
**Infrastructure**

**Policies to Manage Growth:** Participants unanimously felt that the county should adopt policies to encourage residential growth in areas where infrastructure and services currently exist or are planned for.

**Gravel Roads:**
- There is a general feeling, especially in the north, that gravel roads are inevitable and just part of the experience of living in a rural area.
- Traffic load should be the determining factor in whether a gravel road is paved.
- Some people also felt that school bus routes should be paved.
- As far as who should pay for road improvement, most felt the expense should be paid through a combination of developers’ fees and the property taxes of the owners who would benefit from the improved road.

**North-South Connections:**
- The creation of more north-south connections in the county would be great, but it is not a high priority.
- Many people have the perception that there have been several attempts to create more north-south connections through the county that have either failed or run into roadblocks.
- Many mentioned they would like to see these types of connections being planned for today so that in the future — when funding is available and the need is justified — it will be easier to put a new road in.
- It seemed that widening the roads that currently exist is more of a priority due to safety concerns (see Other Concerns).

**Fire Protection:**
- Requiring residential subdivisions to have fire hydrants and adequate fire protection in Leavenworth County is a unanimous “yes”; however, participants understand that most rural areas do not have access to the right size of water lines, meaning this would be a substantial cost.
- Participants felt the developers should take on that cost.
- However, several people suggested that government-provided fire protection is just one of those things you may have to sacrifice to live out in the county, where response times are longer and many firefighters are volunteers.

**Countywide Sewer Program:**
- Participants saw the value of a countywide sewer program, as long as future density supports it.
- The main concerns were whether the cities should be worrying about extending sewers to their urban growth districts, and whether a countywide sewer program would increase taxes. Many rural participants have septic systems that they are happy with. Others feel that septic is outdated and a sewer program would be better.

**Rural Internet Services:**
- Most participants across all groups would strongly support Leavenworth County exploring ways to incentivize internet companies to provide more or faster internet services out in the unincorporated areas.
- However, some questioned whether this was an appropriate task for county workers, rather than relying on private enterprise to meet demands.
- There was a desire to see more competition among internet service providers in the county.
- Several people mentioned that they work from home on their computers, or would if they had better internet speeds.
- Farmers acknowledged that there is agricultural technology they are unable to take advantage of without internet access in their areas.

**Hiking, Biking, and Equestrian Trails:**
- Overall, participants agreed county-built trails "would be nice," but are not a priority.
- Most felt that trails should be the cities’ responsibility, or paid for by some kind of outside funding like a private developer or a grant, not with county tax dollars.
- There was concern about who would pay for maintenance after trails are created.
- Northern groups and some of the people who live in the unincorporated areas were concerned that trails would bring more people to the edge of their property, which could bring security issues.
- Some were intrigued by the idea of creating trails out of abandoned railroad tracks, if that is possible.
- The safety concern of bikers riding on roads and highways came up at almost every group. Participants felt that creating wider roads with bike lanes or wider shoulders was a better solution than creating separate trails for them.
Importance of Preserving Farmland:

- Preserving land for agriculture was of high importance to all groups.
- There were no specific areas they would like to see preserved.

Pushing Development Toward Cities:

- Participants were unanimously in favor of the county adopting policies that push the majority of new development towards cities to preserve large swaths of farmland.
- Besides preservation of farmland, participants felt it just makes more sense to build near existing city-provided infrastructure and other services.
- Keeping growth near cities seemed like the unanimous, logical answer.

Minimum Agriculture Zoning District:

- Most people did not support a minimum 20-acre zoning district in rural areas to protect farmland.
- The cost of a 20-acre parcel of land is high, which limits who can build out in the county.
- Many people brought up the scenario of when a farmer wants to split up their land among their children. Nearly all participants who farmed did not want the government to be able to tell them how to split up their property, because in some cases they want to give land to a child for a personal residence, and in others they want to give them land to farm. People did not like being required to keep a parcel at a five-acre minimum because it forced their child to have to maintain more land than they want and could result in land being wasted (not farmed) in the future.
- The southern group agreed that there should be a minimum, but 20 is too large. A minimum of five acres, which is the current minimum, was suggested.

Regulating Minimum Size of Agricultural Parcels:

- It was difficult for groups to come to a conclusion as to whether the county should regulate the minimum size of agricultural parcels of land.
- Most people did not want to see agricultural land subdivided into many smaller pieces, but also felt that it is inevitable.
- Forty acres, the current agricultural land size, was seen as a lot of land and agriculture can happen on much smaller pieces of land. No one wanted to discourage these types of small-scale agricultural activities by requiring a minimum size.
Agriculture (Continued)

Agritourism:
- When asked whether the county should explore new possible agriculture assets that could be marketed to bring in agritourism dollars to the county, both groups turned to discussing some of the existing private agritourism activities already being done in the county. Several of the southerners felt the county needed to have some kind of regulation of these businesses, due to the road traffic they generate.
- Most people seemed to think that the county should not hinder agritourism, but no one really advocated the county actively developing and promoting new agritourism opportunities.

Economic Development

Reaching the County’s Potential:
- All participants felt the county was not growing to meet its potential.
- Participants see Leavenworth County as a “bedroom community,” which they believe is hindering a lot of potential business growth.
- However, many people do not want to lose the rural and “small-town” feel of Leavenworth County, either.
- There is a worry that Leavenworth’s reputation for being anti-business is also hindering economic development.

Satisfaction with Economic Development Efforts:
- In the north, people are dissatisfied with economic development efforts. They felt the taxpayers have funded multiple studies — such as the airport study — that ended up going nowhere. They worry their tax dollars are not being used efficiently for this purpose. One proposed solution was that economic development should be separate from the county, to avoid any political bias affecting efforts.
- In the south, there was dissatisfaction with the efforts of LCDC. Most people feel they are not including the public in their efforts and, like the north, are not seeing results they would expect for the time and money that has been put into it. The cities and the county should be working together for economic development purposes.

Desire for More County Involvement:
- The northern group does not think the county should be more actively involved in economic development. Their reasons for objecting to more involvement were a concern that it would cost too much but produce little, and that free enterprise should be allowed to control what happens in the county.
- Alternatively, the southern group thinks the county needs to be much more involved in economic development, particularly with regard to representing the rural areas.

Sales Tax Program for Retention, Expansion, and Recruitment of Businesses: People would rather see a sales tax than an increase on their property taxes. However, there was concern the county does not have the tax base or enough retail business to generate adequate funds through sales tax. They were undecided as to whether this type of program would be useful.

Tax Abatements or Incentives for Private Companies:
- Answers were mixed as to whether the county should offer tax abatements or cash incentives to private companies in order to recruit them to locate in Leavenworth County.
- Some felt these incentives would be unfair to existing businesses and that trying to create something like Legends in Leavenworth County would be pointless because people would still go to Legends to shop.
- Both groups used Legends as an example of something positive, and the southern group felt that Power and Light in Kansas City had been a great way to revitalize the downtown area through a TIF district. Both groups would be in favor of something like that happening in Leavenworth County.

Types of New Development that Should be Pursued:
- Participants would like economic development efforts to pursue a mix of development types, including commercial, industrial, and real estate. They would like to encourage light industry that creates living wage jobs, so that people can afford to buy houses and spend money in the county.
- Focusing on clean or “green” industries was brought up as a shared value of county residents.
- Participants would also like to see shopping and entertainment, particularly chain businesses such as a Target or Chipotle, as well as businesses that encourage tourism. However, they understand that retail follows rooftops, and that the county needs more primary industries and housing first.
Land Use and Zoning

Building Codes in the County:
- Almost all participants felt a uniform building code in the county for new structures would be beneficial for safety and aesthetic reasons. Most were surprised that these codes did not already exist.
- Participants with farms would like to be able to build small buildings such as chicken coops without adhering to a strict set of codes, so they were in favor as long as the codes only applied to residential structures.
- When it comes to paying for a building code program, the southern groups overwhelmingly favored a combination of property owner and the county.
- The northern group mentioned that the property owner or the builder/developer should have to pay for it.

Cities Enforcing Building Codes in the Urban Growth District:
- The southern group unanimously felt that if something is not part of a city, it should not have to obey city codes.
- The northern group was split. Some felt that if the buildings are in the urban growth district, then it makes sense to go along with the city. Others felt that allowing this would be too much government interference, and that the state designates the urban growth boundary and the state does not have a policy about enforcing codes within that boundary.

Requiring Residential Subdivisions to Meet City Design Standards:
- Northern participants thought that the urban growth district will be part of the city soon enough, so it only makes sense to require them to meet the city's design standards.
- However, some people, especially in the southern group, felt that since residences in the urban growth boundary are technically in the county, those people would have no representation in the city government and therefore should not have to adhere to city regulations. The southern group was not in favor of enacting this requirement.

Special Use Permits:
- Many participants felt that the special use permits were just a way for businesses to avoid zoning regulations, which interferes with planned growth.
- They felt that if there is a business that does not fit the zoning regulations in an area, there needs to be an extensive process to decide whether they are allowed a special use permit, and that right now, some businesses that have been allowed to operate under special use permits are doing so without enough consideration going into the decision.
- Some people were in favor of doing away with special use permits altogether.

Urban Growth Boundaries

Encouraging Residential Growth in Planned Subdivisions:
- Participants felt that residential growth needed to be planned, but that the county shouldn't necessarily be encouraging it.
- Most participants hoped that these planned subdivisions would be nearer to existing cities, and not necessarily out in the county.

Control Where New Development Occurs: Participants felt that the county should control where growth occurs, so that new growth is planned with the future of the county in mind. This includes working with cities to create a plan that fulfills both the county's and the cities' visions for the future.

Control What Type of Development Occurs: In regard to unincorporated areas, all participants agreed that the county should control what type of new development occurs, and that this should be done through zoning.

Promote Denser Development in Urban Growth Management Areas: Participants were in favor of denser development as long as it is not “out in the county” where things like apartment complexes don’t make sense. They agree there is a need for multi-family residences.

Actively Preserving Nature Areas:
- Preserving nature areas was extremely important to all participants, if it is done in the right way.
- Concerns included where the preserved land would come from, whether the preserved land would be taken from landowners, and whether there are any specific areas worth preserving.
- Some people mentioned that residents are choosing not to develop in areas in the floodplain anyway, so nature “preserves itself.”
- Participants agreed that Leavenworth County is beautiful and they prioritize keeping the land as it is as much as possible.
Other Concerns

**Road Safety:** Roads and road safety came up in several focus groups. One concern was that paving narrow, rural roads leads to farmers and their equipment sharing the road with people who drive above the speed limit. They would like to see strategies that help minimize the risk of accidents.

Similarly, people are biking on the narrow roads with little or no shoulder, such as Tonganoxie Road, because there are no other places for them to bike in the county. This worries many drivers in the county and several people suggested widening the roads to add a much wider shoulder for bikers to use.

**Cul-de-sacs:** Many participants were frustrated with the increase of cul-de-sacs as part of residential subdivisions. More and more neighborhoods are being created without through streets, which leads to unplanned, winding roads. They would like to see a plan created that guides developers as to what kind of roads they can build and where through streets need to be placed.

**Transparency:** Many people felt that there has been a lack of transparency from the county government in the past, which they believe has caused a lot of the issues, such as with the proposed Tyson facility. They felt that if the county had involved more residents in the planning process, conflicts could have been avoided. Several people mentioned feeling the focus groups were a good way to include them in the process.
Planning Charrette

Purpose and Overview
While the visioning workshop lays a sturdy foundation for what the Plan should consider and include in the final product, the charrette takes a deeper dive into specific topics of the Plan. The charrette produces a consensus-built conceptual plan (but not final!) based on iterative feedback.

Members of the public, SCAC, TC, and elected officials are brought together to ensure a clear understanding of their desires for the future of the county, to gather local knowledge related to the issues and opportunities within the county, and to build consensus around a multifaceted solution: this Comprehensive Plan. The charrette advances the creation of the Plan through conversations and responses to the data presented by the planning team. The locals’ insight, combined with the planning team’s expertise, focuses the Plan on preferred transportation, land use, development, and redevelopment concepts.

The charrette took place over three days, October 1-3, 2019, at the Heritage Center (109 Delaware St, Leavenworth, KS 66048) in Leavenworth, Kansas. The SCAC and TC met with the planning team multiple times in order to pass on their insight into the county’s issues and opportunities and crucial aspects to the Plan.

In preparation for the charrette, the planning team created maps of the county, analyzed and evaluated the county’s natural and built environments, created a project website, conducted and analyzed a public survey, summarized demographic and economic data and trends, conducted interviews with key stakeholders, and performed an in-person assessment of the county. This information provided the necessary context for the planning team to ask the right questions during the charrette to unveil the consensus-driven vision for the county.

Between each session with the committees, the public, and Leavenworth County staff members, the planning team was able to study the information given, summarize the feedback, create concepts for the plan, and/or alter the concepts according to input received. A summary of each day’s activities and outcomes is provided on the following pages.

What’s the Purpose of a Charrette?

1. **ASSEMBLE**
   Assemble decision makers, such as county staff members, elected officials, business owners, developers, property owners, neighborhood associations, and other stakeholders.

2. **COLLABORATE**
   Collaborate with the decision makers in information sharing about the county, iterative improvement concepts, and feedback and revisions.

3. **FINE TUNE**
   Fine tune the county land use and other improvement concepts through strategic conversations with stakeholders, the public, the county, and involved agencies.

4. **CREATE**
   Create a community-driven, realistic plan, grounded in market and economic reality.
**Day One**

The charrette started with a brief presentation detailing the charrette’s purpose, process, and schedule. The planning team then presented the county’s existing conditions; a breakdown and summary of the county’s demographics, economic conditions, and market forces; and the public survey analysis and focus group summary.

From there, the committees completed a series of exercises generally focused on identifying the opportunities and constraints within the county.

The planning team split the committees into four groups and asked the groups to cycle through a series of stations where they prioritized the needs, wants, desires, impediments, obstacles, and dislikes compiled from the visioning workshop. The committee members were given a set of sticky dots and asked to vote on the items that they thought were the most important assessments of the county.

From there the committees were led to review and answer questions based on the existing conditions presented by the planning team. These six topics included:

- Land Use
- Transportation and Mobility
- Economic Development
- Parks, Recreation, and Quality of Life
- Infrastructure and Public Services
- Health and Wellness

These topics were arranged in stations where the groups answered specific questions related to each topic. Their responses were recorded on large post-it sheets for everyone to see. This way, each person could visibly see the thought process; this is a critical element of a charrette. The full record of all charrette exercises is included in Appendix B Community Engagement Summary.

In the afternoon, the Technical Committee meeting allowed for interaction and discussion between technical experts to discuss utilities, stormwater, and other infrastructure topics, and generate ideas for the Plan. This meeting provides great value to the planning team as multiple agencies, communities, and interests are represented in a singular location. The meeting allowed the planning team to ask technical questions, prior to concept generation. The discussion focused on development standards, the limitations of USDA requirements for rural water districts, and proper location for residential development within the county.
Day Two
To begin day two, the planning team reviewed the prior day’s work and compiled the information to begin generating ideas and conceptual plans for the public open house that evening. The public open house was the primary activity scheduled for day two but required the creation of initial concepts from the planning team. The planning team worked throughout the day to create these concepts. They produced a land use development map to have the public give feedback on where they thought development of any type should occur within the county as well as a transportation and connectivity map to demonstrate regional trail plans, which could connect the county to the Kansas City metropolitan area.

Prior to the public open house, the committees were brought back to preview the public open house and encouraged to stay to act as champions for the Plan by explaining and discussing the topics and ideas with the public. The two-hour public open house finished the day and resulted in much feedback from the community on the existing conditions and the future of Leavenworth County.
Public Open House #1
The public open house was on October 2, 2019 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Heritage Center in Leavenworth. The open house was advertised to the public through the Plan’s Facebook account, the project website, email, a press release, and other various outlets.

The participants were greeted by a member of the planning team and given an introduction to the comprehensive planning process and directions for the evening. There were a number of stations created for the public to inspect and give feedback on. During the open house, the public had the opportunity to answer all the same questions the committees had answered the day prior. Their responses were captured in the same way and placed adjacent to the committees’ answers. There was much overlap between the public’s responses and the committees’ responses. For a list of all responses, see Appendix B.

As the event was intentionally informal and did not include a formal presentation, members of the planning team were stationed around the room to clarify information, answer questions, and gather additional input through written comments and one-on-one or group conversations.

Public feedback was plentiful. While topics of interest and conversation were mixed, the necessity of improving traffic accessibility and flow, preserving agricultural lands, and properly managing growth and development in the county rose to the surface as a prominent sentiment shared by the varied groups represented at the open house.

Public Open House #1 Stations
The first public open house was set up in a circular fashion, allowing attendees to start on one side of the room and work their way around to all the stations. Seven stations were included in the open house and a representative from the planning team was stationed at each area to answer questions and engage with attendees. The stations included:

1. Sign-In
2. Learn about the Project
3. What’s Going on in the County?
4. What We’ve Heard So Far
5. Issues and Opportunities
6. Initial Ideas
7. What Did We Miss?
Day Three
The last day of the charrette began with a review of the feedback generated during both prior days of the charrette with a focus on the ideas and content generated by the public during the open house. The planning team studied the feedback and began to integrate it into the maps and policy recommendations.

The planning team took time in the morning to discuss and deliberate over the direction and content of what would be integrated into the Plan based on the engagement activities completed throughout the earlier sessions. The conceptual future land use plan combined the interactions and public engagement and feedback gathered by the planning team.

The final session of the charrette gave the SCAC and TC a chance to review the narrowed concepts and recommendations to provide comments and direction. Attendees provided written and verbal reactions to the content as they reviewed the critical ideas and issues facing Leavenworth County and the conceptual plans.
Public Open House #2

Purpose and Overview
The second public open house was on February 19, 2020 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Lansing Community Center. The open house was advertised to the public through the Plan’s Facebook account, the project website, email, a press release, and other various outlets.

The attendees were greeted by a member of the planning team and given an introduction to the comprehensive planning process and the purpose of and directions for the evening. There were a number of stations created for the attendees to view and give feedback on the topic or information provided. Any and all comments were captured via sticky notes and sticky dots. For a list of all questions and received comments, see Appendix B.

As the event was intentionally informal and did not include a formal presentation, members of the planning team were stationed around the room to clarify information, answer questions, and gather additional input through written comments and one-on-one or group conversations.

Much feedback was received. With regard to the future land use plan concept, concern about too much land subdivision (and not properly protecting large swaths of agricultural land) was shared. Specific transportation network comments were gathered, as well, such as the potential of connecting County Road 33 to County Road 29. As a response to what was missing from the Plan, several comments regarding high speed internet were collected.

Public Open House #2 Stations
The second public open house was set up in a circular fashion, allowing attendees to start on one side of the room and work their way around to all the stations. Six stations were included in the open house and a representative from the planning team was stationed at each area to answer questions and engage with attendees. The stations included:

1. Sign-In
2. Learn about the Project
3. Where Have We Been?
4. What Did We Hear?
5. Where are We At Now?
6. What is Next? What Did We Miss?
Purpose and Overview
To ensure even greater transparency, the planning team posted the draft Plan, as presented at the second public open house, online on the project website. The public was able to review and comment on the draft Plan from February 24, 2020 to March 9, 2020. The online comment period was advertised to the public through the Plan’s Facebook account, the project website, email, a press release, and other various outlets.

Those interested in commenting on the draft Plan were able to do so anonymously or provide their name and email address in order to revisit their comments during the open commenting period.

Three-hundred fifty-one comments were received during the two-week period. Sentiment was shared primarily regarding land subdivision minimum acreages, protecting agricultural land, urban growth management areas, wind energy, open space care and management, high speed internet, and more. For a list a record of all received comments, see Appendix B.

The planning team read through each comment, organized all the comments into topics, and prepared an orderly spreadsheet of the comments to the Leavenworth County planning staff members and the Board of County Commissioners for their review.

The Board of County Commissioners provided final direction, directing the planning team to alter the draft Plan in various ways according to the comments received.
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Section 4

Land Use and Development Plan

This section identifies appropriate land uses, densities, and development areas within the county for the next 10 to 20 years. Figure 4.1 Future Land Use Plan recognizes the county's vast size and diversity and presents a flexible and balanced approach to assist county staff members, elected officials, the development community, and the general public in managing growth, while effectively protecting the county's rural heritage, agricultural land, and rich natural resources.

The recommendations within this section are based on the findings documented in Sections 1-3, but also on the guiding principles: elevate and compete; preserve and sustain; and communicate and coordinate. This section helps the county prioritize its land, resources, and infrastructure investment by directing most new residential and commercial growth into existing municipal boundaries and adjacent growth areas. Such a strategy allows for ample open space protection, agricultural use preservation, and the managed development of employment and industry areas that have appropriate access.

This section first presents the Future Land Use Plan (Figure 4.1) and provides descriptions of each land use category and other elements shown on the graphic. Targets and strategies (defined below) are then presented and described to achieve the Future Land Use Plan.

Targets and Strategies

**Targets** are what the county would like to accomplish; they are the big ideas to move the county forward for the next 10 to 20 years. Targets are more qualitative than quantitative and answer the "what" rather than the "how."

**Strategies** present an approach or method for reaching or exceeding the targets. Strategies answer the "how" and can be broken down into tasks for individual organizations and/or responsible parties.
Figure 4.1
Future Land Use Plan

Data Sources: Leavenworth County and Ochsner Hare & Hare, the Olsson Studio

Note: The existing industrial zoning along each river bottom will be maintained.

* Also known as Zone A or Zone AE, which are FEMA-defined Special Flood Hazard Areas

** Residential (2.5-Acre Minimum) is the designated future land use within a quarter-mile of each side of the centerline of all improved roads within Leavenworth County, unless the quarter-mile area on either side of the centerline of an improved road is designated as a denser future land use, such as Residential (3 Units / Acre), Mixed Residential, or Mixed Use. "Improved" roads refer to all paved roads within Leavenworth County, not including those roads that have been hard-surfaced through the dust-abatement process. Due to sporadic data inaccuracy, Figure 4.1 Future Land Use Plan may show this quarter-mile Residential (2.5-Acre Minimum) buffer along roads that are not improved. In such cases, the Residential (2.5-Acre Minimum) quarter-mile buffer does not apply to either side of the unimproved road's centerline.
Future Land Use Plan

Establishing a future land use plan is an essential first part of a comprehensive plan, as it provides the framework for future development and growth within the county. Figure 4.1 Future Land Use Plan ensures that future development within the county achieves the goals of the community and provides defined growth areas to, in turn, protect valuable natural features and agricultural land. Without a future land use plan, development decision making will be haphazard at best, or maintain the status quo.

Each of the future land use designations as shown on Figure 4.1 are described and illustrated on the pages that follow. Land use designations describe the primary land use and development intensity of parcels within the county’s jurisdiction. Although land use designations on their own are not legally binding, these designations provide the foundation for zoning. The zoning code is the regulatory tool used to implement the future land use plan and policies. The alignment of the future land use plan and zoning code is critical, as is outlined in the strategies of this section.

Future Land Use Plan Categories

Mixed Use

The Mixed Use land use category includes existing and proposed areas for development retail, service, office, and industrial uses. Mixed Use is primarily designated along existing major corridors, including US 24/40 between Tonganoxie and Basehor, and as a way to introduce higher density development in areas of natural expansion for Basehor and Lansing. Mixed Use offers flexibility in density and land use. This category should provide for the daily needs of residents and visitors. Nodal development is an important consideration within this category; key interchanges and intersections within this category should be more densely developed. Given this land use category’s proximity to major roadways, special consideration should be given to building design, access, parking, and landscaping, while minimizing any negative impacts on adjacent residential uses.

Mixed Residential

The Mixed Residential land use category includes existing and proposed areas for single- and multi-family residential development. This is the highest density residential development land use category within the county, and permits single-family residences, townhomes, duplexes, and, where appropriate, apartments. This land use category is predominantly located directly adjacent to existing city boundaries, or the Mixed Use land use category. Traditional, yet smaller lot, single-family developments are a natural fit within this category, but flexibility in residential format is encouraged. Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), as described in the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations for Leavenworth County should be considered within this land use category as a way to ensure high quality development, innovative and imaginative site planning, and the conservation of natural resources and land.
The Residential (3 Units per Acre) land use category includes existing and proposed areas for single-family residential uses with a gross maximum density of three units per acre. This category is generally designated in areas either directly outside of current city boundaries, or adjacent to Mixed Residential uses. This higher density residential land use category works to increase development density within the cities’ growth areas – effectively minimizing dense development encroachment in areas to be preserved and/or maintained as agriculture and large lot residential. Where appropriate, conservation design is encouraged in order to cluster lots and maintain common open space areas within such developments.

The Residential (2.5-Acre Minimum) land use category includes existing and proposed areas for single-family residential uses with a two-and-a-half-acre minimum lot size. This category is generally designated in areas to the west of Leavenworth, Lansing, and Basehor to permit large lot residential development outside of, but near municipalities. Public sewer and water service will eventually need to reach such areas, but should first be prioritized in the Residential (3 Units per Acre) and Mixed Residential land use categories.

The Residential Estate (5-Acre Minimum) land use category includes existing and proposed areas for single-family residential uses with a five-acre minimum lot size. This category is generally designated in areas that are not projected to have access to public sewer and water services. Residential Estate development is appropriate in unincorporated areas of the county. Increased densities are encouraged where appropriate.

Following an in-depth analysis of County Road 1 (CR-1), south of Tonganoxie, the county is considering rezoning the area shown as “Leavenworth County Road 1 Planning Area” on Figure 4.1 to align with the preferred land use plan in the analysis. The Leavenworth County Road 1 Land Use Analysis studied the existing land development conditions within the six-mile study area located between Tonganoxie’s southern limits and K-32.

A wide range of land use development categories are envisioned in this area, from open space and agricultural preserve to high density residential and medium intensity industrial. Land uses are primarily mixed east, northeast, and southeast of the I-70/C R-1 interchange, with open space designated along the entirety of Nine Mile Creek. Medium intensity industrial uses are proposed west of this interchange. South of Cantrell Road, the area is almost exclusively reserved for open space, except for the intersection of CR-1 and Linwood Road, which is slated for commercial. North of the I-70 and CR-1 interchange exhibits much higher density of uses compared to south of the interchange, with a wide range of land uses including commercial, varying residential density developments, and mixed use/mixed use cluster. This Plan supports the land use recommendations and proposed rezoning for the CR-1 planning area.
Targets

1. Establish strong relationships with each county municipality to ensure joint and mutually beneficial current and long-term planning efforts.

2. Support new commercial, industrial, residential, and mixed use growth that balances the desire for economic development and a heightened tax base with Leavenworth County’s predominantly small town feel and rural heritage.

3. Concentrate new residential, commercial, and industrial development in areas where utility infrastructure networks are available or easily extended.

4. Ensure residential development within the county meets the needs (including safety) and desires of various county residents and allows residents to age in place.

5. Build upon the county’s multimodal infrastructure and locational advantages to expand industry and employment opportunities in key areas of the county.

6. Preserve the most productive farmland as a source for viable agricultural activities that will enhance the county’s economy and continue its rural character.

Strategies

Align county zoning and subdivision regulations with the targets and strategies stated in this Plan. Zoning and subdivision regulations are a critical tool to guide development within counties and cities. Zoning districts and their related regulations must be regularly evaluated by a community to ensure that (1) their desired style of development is possible and that (2) the community’s needs are met through the current regulations. It is recommended that county staff undertake a complete review of the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations for Leavenworth County, Kansas, following adoption—and as one of the steps to implement—the comprehensive plan.

While rezoning (change the zoning district) may not be necessary throughout the entire unincorporated county, some of the future land uses illustrated on Figure 4.1 will be best served and implemented by certain zoning districts. It is recommended that as development and redevelopment take place within the county, county staff members work with applicants to determine the zoning district that best fits the applicant’s needs that also aligns with the future land use plan. Additionally, properties can be rezoned outside of a development proposal. If a full-scale rezoning of the county is pursued, existing land uses can be “legal non-conforming” uses that are grandfathered in until such a time that a major improvement proposal comes forward for that property. This discourages reinvestment in uses that do not implement the future land use plan.
Identify and prioritize commercial and mixed use development along key corridors and at strategic nodes with a high degree of access to major transportation routes. Leavenworth County's large land area, natural resources, and transportation system afford the opportunity to create a blend of urban and rural environments that provide the template for the county and its principal population and economic centers to adapt to future trends in land use, economics, demographics, and transportation. The county benefits from an extensive highway system and proximity to Kansas City International Airport.

Most new commercial and mixed use development should occur in incorporated areas, as they have a higher density of consumers and possess existing infrastructure that can be built upon. However, commercial and mixed use growth should also develop at several strategic nodes and along major transportation corridors in unincorporated areas, with possible expansion outward over time into corridor-style development.

Recommended commercial and mixed use growth locations include:
- U.S. 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie;
- Intersection of U.S. 24/40 and CR-1; and
- 155th Street between Basehor and Lansing (as a long-term play).

While these commercial areas will likely be relatively low-density, they will be able to provide goods and services to both county residents, regional travelers, and commuters. To complement these more prominent nodes, neighborhood commercial development opportunities will also occur in response to continued new home construction and population growth nearer to the municipalities.

Focus county investment into unincorporated areas positioned for industrial growth, especially on high access transportation corridors. The county is well-situated for economic and employment growth and expansion due to its existing multimodal infrastructure and locational advantage. While the county should direct most residential and commercial growth into municipalities and Initial Growth Areas (660-feet buffer around each incorporated city), the county should actively promote industrial development and expansion within targeted unincorporated areas. This may include investing in high quality transportation infrastructure to assist in the movement of goods, as well as coordinating with utility companies and local industry to provide high-quality and reliable infrastructure, including water, energy, and telecommunications to these priority industrial growth areas.

In addition to the four active business parks currently operating in Leavenworth County, prospective future major employment nodes include:
- U.S. 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie;
- CR-1 corridor north and south of I-70; and
- K-7 corridor between Basehor and Lansing.

Below: Center roadway is U.S. 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie, looking east.
Establish different categories of special use permits with varying submittal requirements and factors to be considered. Because the county is primarily zoned as a rural zoning designation, special use permits for industrial uses and many commercial uses in unincorporated areas are all too common. While the special use permit process in inherently worthwhile, as it subjects development proposals to more scrutiny (resulting in a better end product for the development and surrounding properties), the process should be streamlined.

It is recommended that the county create different categories of special uses, dependent on their scale, use, and potential impact on health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding properties. Various models of special use review should be explored. The following types of special uses should be considered:

- **Type 1:** Uses on large tracts of land that are recreational or public/quasi-public in nature, but occasionally can include accessory uses or limited characteristics that can be detrimental to adjoining property if not controlled or constrained.
- **Type 2:** Uses related to communications or utilities, which tend to be out of character to the land uses in the immediate vicinity.
- **Type 3:** Uses with unique characteristics and/or potential to produce nuisance impacts such as light glare, noise, traffic, litter, and more.
- **Type 4:** Uses that are largely industrial operations that frequently generate hazardous or intense nuisance factors. The county has the responsibility to control, mitigate, or eliminate those attributes of such uses as are deemed hazardous or detrimental to the community’s health, safety, and welfare.

To ensure sufficient review of special use permit applications and proper regulation, applications must be complete and include much detail. Generally, the more intense the special use, the more application requirements, factors to be considered, and resulting conditions.

Promote efficient residential densities, types, and values. From 2019 to 2040, the county’s population is forecast to increase by over 19,000 residents. Continued population growth will generate increased demand for retail goods and services, commercial space, and new residential housing units. To meet diverse needs, future housing stock should provide for a variety of for-sale and rental housing options and price ranges. Most of the residential growth should be directed inward, either within city boundaries or within Initial Growth Areas.

As shown in Figure 4.1, four residential land use types are identified. To maintain the rural character that draws and keeps many residents within the county, large portions of the county are designated as “Residential Estate (5-Acre Minimum)” and “Residential (2.5-Acre Minimum).” Such land use types secure an area for large lot residential uses. As one moves closer to identified development corridors, such as U.S. 24/40, and incorporated areas, residential densities should increase to three units per acre and higher. In this way, rural lifestyles are still encouraged, and higher residential densities are directed to, or closer to, areas where utility infrastructure is available, provision of services are more readily available.

Explore and adopt appropriate county building codes that primarily protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents. Building codes address many important concerns, including public health, safety, welfare, and environmental protection. In large part, building codes establish a building’s quality, safety and energy performance for years to come. Leavenworth County currently does not have building codes. Given that the county is no longer federally classified as a rural county, the county should ensure a basic level of consistent and safe building practices countywide. Building codes provide many benefits, including assurance of cost efficiency and property value, and reduction of damage from natural disasters.

The development and subsequent adoption of a building code should be done in a measured and transparent manner. The county should review existing model codes available from state and federal sources to determine the regulations that best fit the needs of the county. The building code should not regulate aesthetics, but should include code basics, such as fire safety codes and structural standards. The code’s development process should include public engagement, gathering feedback from all parts of the unincorporated county. Ultimately, the building code should be adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. Like this Plan, building codes must be revisited often to ensure they are reflective of current best practices.
Utilize a "land first" or conservation-based approach to planning in unincorporated areas of the county to minimize premature development of agricultural land. “Land first” refers to a set of principles and strategies designed to create more livable and sustainable communities in which development should first take into consideration the value of natural ecology, features, and functions of land before determining the most appropriate design. Conservation design, which requires the conservation, preservation, and enhancement of natural and environmental resources, is one way to implement a “land first” approach to development. Ultimately, the “land first” approach values healthy ecological functions, while still permitting development.

Leavenworth County has a vital agricultural community and natural beauty that should be protected from irreversible changes that often accompany development. To accomplish this “land first” practice, conservation design should be widely implemented. In areas where extensive environmental resources exist, conservation design is likely the best guiding framework for new development. Conservation design seeks to preserve the integrity of a landscape’s natural functions, protect water resources, enhance community character and connectivity, and provide for greater design flexibility and housing affordability. This framework includes a variety of tools, such as:

- Standards for open space, greenways, and trails;
- Density bonuses;
- Protection of natural areas, including wetlands, treed areas, and steep slopes;
- Clustering of lots and flexible lot standards;
- Efficient road networks;
- Best management practices for infiltrating and filtering stormwater runoff;
- Natural landscaping;
- Tree protection;
- Long-term stewardship of natural areas and open space; and
- Lighting standards that reduce light pollution.

Practically, the county should advance a "land first" initiative. It is recommended that the county adopt a conservation design addendum to their subdivision regulations such that future developments implement these principles, so long as the developments are on individual septic systems and not community systems.

Utilize the Land Evaluation component of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system to identify and encourage the protection of the most productive farmland. The LESA was developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USA) to identify areas with highly productive soils when properly drained and cultivated. Areas are given a land evaluation score between zero and 100, with a greater value representing higher potential productivity. Soils with a score less than 80 require more intensive use of resources, while soils with a score higher than 80 have been identified as primary targets for protection. To enhance and further the county’s agricultural nature, the county should put policies in place to protect highly productive areas from development and guard existing agricultural uses that utilize highly productive soils.

Given Leavenworth County’s agricultural capabilities, the county should endorse and utilize the Land Evaluation (LE) component of the LESA system. The LESA scoring system can be used to determine a site's appropriateness for development and should be integrated into the county's zoning and subdivision regulations. This system will be especially important for areas designated as “Rural Agriculture” if a rezoning case/development proposal arises in such an area.
Section 5

Transportation and Mobility Plan

Access within the county is limited due to the topography, natural borders (rivers and creeks), and I-70, which hampers residential growth and employment opportunities. Many of the connections that do exist are dirt or gravel roads that cannot support significant traffic volumes. This places a burden on the county from a maintenance perspective, while simultaneously making roadways within potential annexation areas unattractive candidates for city annexation. As the transportation system controls the movement of goods and people throughout the county and beyond, a properly planned and executed transportation plan is essential for providing efficient, convenient, and safe traffic flow. As such, this section outlines targets and strategies that address these challenges head on.

The creation of a long-range transportation plan is a fundamental prerequisite to ensuring future success. Although Figure 4.1 outlines future commercial, residential, and mixed use developments, if the transportation network leading to these future sites is inadequate, they will be underutilized. Further, if the only means of reaching future activity centers is by car, it drastically reduces the populations that can access the goods and services being provided.

This section presents the Transportation Plan (Figure 5.1) and describes the features illustrated. The targets and strategies that follow are high level and specific recommendations Leavenworth County can implement to realize the Transportation Plan.

**Targets and Strategies**

**Targets** are what the county would like to accomplish; they are the big ideas to move the county forward for the next 10 to 20 years. Targets are more qualitative than quantitative and answer the "what" rather than the "how."

**Strategies** present an approach or method for reaching or exceeding the targets. Strategies answer the "how" and can be broken down into tasks for individual organizations and/or responsible parties.
Figure 5.1
Transportation Plan

Data Sources: Leavenworth County, Mid-America Regional Council, and Ochsner Hare & Hare, the Olsson Studio
Transportation Plan

This section addresses transportation and mobility challenges within Leavenworth County. Figure 5.1 emphasizes connectivity in all directions by upgrading existing unpaved roads, strategic intersection improvements, and implementation of regional efforts related to non-vehicular transportation. Figure 5.1 should be implemented in concert with proposed land use and development patterns (see Figure 4.1) to facilitate countywide connections that align with future growth.

The following sections outline the components of Figure 5.1 that identify important corridors and connections – both vehicular and non-vehicular – within the county. Each feature of the Transportation Plan is described to provide an understanding of what is recommended, the function it serves, and how it would improve mobility in Leavenworth County. As the population grows, it will be with increasing importance that the roadway system is equipped to handle the increased traffic volumes. As most county residents must commute for work, goods, services, and entertainment, the transportation system must be one that is responsive and prepared to ensure an acceptable level of service.

NOTE: This is a planning-level document. All proposed roadway connections, roadway upgrades, trails, and bikeways are for illustrative purposes only. Final decisions on future transportation and trail connectivity would be made as additional planning and design progresses.

Transportation Plan Elements

Proposed Existing Road Upgrade

A recurring theme throughout the public engagement process was the need for enhanced mobility throughout the county. Although east to west connectivity was frequently discussed, the need for better north to south transportation routes was expressed at length. In a perfect world, multiple north to south and east to west connections would exist countywide. Realistically, though, strategic areas must be targeted to ensure available funds create the most meaningful impact.

As such, the strategy illustrated in Figure 5.1 is one that capitalizes on existing, unpaved roads that can be upgraded to provide greater paved connectivity that improves safety, reduces maintenance, and provides a more reliable transportation network. By concentrating efforts on existing infrastructure, construction costs can be reduced while still meeting the identified goal of enhancing connectivity throughout Leavenworth County and the broader Kansas City metropolitan area.

Proposed Future Roadway Connection

In contrast to the road upgrades illustrated on Figure 5.1, certain connections simply do not exist. These sections have been identified and are proposed for brand new roadways that would tie into either an existing roadway, or a roadway proposed for upgrade. Similar to the rationale for the road upgrades, these proposed roadway connections intend to provide consistent transportation corridors in the county.

Each proposed roadway ties into a known major thoroughfare that enhances access. For instance, Tonganoxie Road is a primary north-south connector in Leavenworth County. However, north of Springdale Road, Tonganoxie Road alternates between gravel and dirt, as well as sections where no roadway exists. This represents an ideal opportunity to consistently connect a stretch of road that capitalizes on an existing major thoroughfare that, with improvements to key areas, creates a consistent north to south connection from Highway 24/40 all the way to K-7.
Given the high cost of transportation infrastructure improvements, upgrades, and new construction, a more financially feasible and time-effective option can include intersection improvements and/or rural roundabouts. Both of these options require less time, materials, and funds to construct while still elevating the level of service, improving traffic flow, and enhancing safety.

At this scale, intersection improvements are not identified on Figure 5.1. However, they should be considered as a strategy for the future. Intersection improvements can include a variety of strategies, including:

- Improving signal timing, which will be a partnership between the cities, county, and state officials;
- Removing elements that hinder sight distance;
- Making drivers aware that they are approaching an intersection through signage; and
- Improving bicycle and pedestrian facilities at the intersection.

Intersection improvements are a recommended option where upgrading several miles of gravel or dirt roads is simply too costly. Until funds become available or traffic volumes mandate additional road upgrades or connections, identified intersection improvements will strategically upgrade high-traffic areas to enhance countywide access.

Rural roundabouts are another identified solution to enhance access and reduce crashes at intersections while being mindful of cost. Typically, roundabouts are designed to allow drivers to maintain speeds in the range of 15 to 25 miles per hour (mph), which reduces time spent at stop signs and increases visibility of oncoming traffic to avoid incursions. Rural roundabouts are designed to accommodate larger farm equipment to ensure areas identified near agricultural properties are able to navigate the county roadways. Five rural roundabouts are shown in potential locations on Figure 5.1; however, more review and study would be required to determine ultimate locations.

Although specific areas for road upgrades and future road construction are illustrated, at the comprehensive plan scale, it is challenging to show exactly where and what type of new roadways should be upgraded or constructed. As such, Figure 5.1 supplements the identified road upgrades and future road construction areas with potential new/upgraded major corridors. These corridors do not necessarily show exactly how the roadway will be made into a major corridor, but rather show where a major corridor is necessary to enhance the county's mobility.

The potential new/upgraded major corridor along 222nd Street/Tonganoxie Road is a critical north-south connection that, when prioritized as a major corridor, can facilitate connection from the southernmost edge of the county to K-7. To better connect the county east to west and beyond, potential new/upgraded major corridors are shown along Dempsey Road, K-5, as well as just north of K-5 as a potential new connection across the Missouri River. With the proposed road upgrades and proposed future roadway connections along Dempsey Road, this becomes a major east to west corridor that consistently connects vehicles from either edge of the county.

The east to west facilitation provided by the potential new/upgraded major corridors along K-5 and just north of K-5 represent more complex transportation challenges than 222nd Street/Tonganoxie Road and Dempsey Road. Rather, these major corridor options along and across the Missouri River intend to provide options of where new connections could be made upon further study in a dedicated Transportation Master Plan to provide enhanced regional access less dependent on I-70 and K-7.

Although labeled as a potential new/upgraded corridor, the corridor illustrated just east of 222nd Street/Tonganoxie Road corridor represents a slightly different style of connection within Leavenworth County. While the other major corridors identified provide a relatively straight and long-distance connection, this corridor connects a shorter distance and serves a different function as a collector roadway. The route is not as linear and curves along the outer belt of Lansing and Fort Leavenworth, supporting those cities’ expansion rather than strictly serving as a county arterial.
This feature of Figure 5.1 represents Mid-America Regional Council’s (MARC) planned MetroGreen regional greenway system (illustrated as Planned Trail on Figure 5.1), a metropolitan trail system that connects urban and rural green corridors throughout seven counties in the Kansas City region. Alongside its goal of trail connectivity and enhancing quality of life, the plan also intends to protect water quality in the region for the next 100 years to conserve and enhance existing natural elements. The MetroGreen system follows streamways and rail corridors to capitalize on existing features, including floodplain lands.

In lieu of proposing a new trail system, the Transportation Plan uses the MetroGreen alignments, with strategic additional trail connections outside of the MetroGreen recommendations that enhance connectivity from a local perspective (illustrated as Proposed Trail on Figure 5.1). The proposed trail alignments connect to MetroGreen’s planned trails and bike trails to provide more options for Leavenworth County residents to recreate and enjoy nature in their backyard.

The planned regional bike trail component is part of the Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan that plans for a cohesive network of bikeways, connected across city, county, and state boundaries to promote active transportation. The bike trails are found along roadway corridors.

The portion of the bike trails in Leavenworth County are part of a 2,000-mile network of on-road and off-road facilities that spans eight counties in the bi-state Kansas City region. Similar to the rationale of the planned MARC MetroGreen trails, Figure 5.1 proposes that Leavenworth County fund and implement the bike trails outlined in the Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan. These bike trails were studied during a dedicated, one-year planning process that focused solely on biking in the Kansas City region. Implementing the planned bike trails will connect Leavenworth County within its own borders and beyond, resulting in transportation alternatives for commuters and recreators alike.

### Targets

1. Ensure roadways under current or future county ownership have been designed for long-lasting success.
2. Enhance access within Leavenworth County, as well as to the broader region and Kansas City metropolitan area.
3. Proactively plan for emerging transportation technologies and modes to ensure Leavenworth County maintains its relevancy as an attractive place for commerce.
4. Integrate planning efforts countywide to ensure transportation infrastructure decisions are made holistically.
5. Develop and prioritize a countywide bike and trail system to improve connectivity, promote open space preservation, and enhance the county’s recreational appeal – both for visitors and residents alike.
6. Continue support and funding for existing transit services while monitoring and anticipating future transit needs as population dictates a need for enhanced offerings.
Strategies

Fund, develop, and adopt a Transportation Master Plan to determine appropriate and prioritized connectivity improvements throughout the county. While Figure 5.1 represents a transportation plan for Leavenworth County, it is important to understand that a dedicated, in-depth study of transportation is highly recommended. This Plan can only address vehicular and multimodal transportation at a high level. Transportation is a complex and multi-faceted issue, particularly in Leavenworth County where the public has indicated a need for enhanced mobility. Therefore, this topic merits an individualized study that can get into the level of detail that simply is not possible at the comprehensive planning level.

A transportation master plan would evaluate existing conditions, identify infrastructure needs, develop evaluation criteria to prioritize the greatest needs, and create an action plan to implement the recommended infrastructure investments or improvements. Community outreach efforts would be focused entirely on transportation challenges and opportunities to put forth goals and strategies that solely consider transportation. To ensure a transportation master plan is a viable option, funding for the study should be included in the county’s upcoming Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

Develop and adopt updated county road standards according to current best practices, such as those published by the FHWA. Updating the county’s road standards is long overdue. The current standards were last updated in 2003 and do not meet current best practices. As such, it is strongly recommended that Leavenworth County update their current road standards, considering national practices and reviews of peer counties in the vicinity.
Implement proposed existing road upgrades, proposed future roadway connections, and potential rural roundabouts. Arguably the greatest challenge facing Leavenworth County from a transportation perspective is the lack of sufficient and consistent connectivity across the county. Throughout the public engagement process, residents indicated the need for enhanced mobility options to ease commute times. Most county residents must use a car to travel to work, school, services, and entertainment, thus making key connections critical to ease transportation woes.

Implementation of the proposed existing road upgrades, proposed future roadways connections, and potential rural roundabouts, as illustrated on Figure 5.1, will facilitate improved transportation connectivity along key north-south and east-west corridors. The proposed improvements take advantage of existing infrastructure to maximize resources while enhancing vehicular service within the county. By providing more and better options for vehicular travel, congestion and delays could be reduced as the roads being traveled would be equipped for the necessary level of service. Alongside route enhancements, potential rural roundabout locations are shown to better facilitate mobility at certain intersections. Additionally, rural roundabouts are generally a more cost-effective solution to upgrade and improve an intersection.

The proposed upgrades and connections shown are based on public input and analysis of how mobility could be enhanced to serve users better. These areas for improvement include the following:

- Several sections of Dempsey Road are currently gravel, which are recommended to be upgraded to a paved surface; specifically, from 243rd Street to 259th Street and 175th Street to just west of 159th Street. These paved upgrades alongside a new road connection from 147th Street to K-7 on the east side of the county would result in an additional and consistent east-west connection.
- From Springdale Road to Hollingsworth Road, it is recommended to upgrade from gravel to pavement, and from Hollingsworth Road to the planned trail a new road must be built to offer a north-south route that connects to K-92 on the north and McClouth Road/K-16 on the south.
- 222nd Street/Tonganoxie Road is used as a major thoroughfare; however, it is not designed to function as such. To transform the entirety of this route and make it a viable alternative to traverse from north to south, upgrading from gravel to pavement in certain sections and constructing new roads is recommended from Springdale Road on the south to Amelia Earhart Road/K-7 on the north. Specifically, from Amelia Earhart Road/K-7 to Mount Olivet Road and Shawnee Road to Lecompton Road, new construction would be required as there is no existing roadway. Between Mount Olivet Road and Shawnee Road, as well as Lecompton Road south to Springdale Road, there are existing gravel roads that should be upgraded.

Further evaluate the potential new/upgraded major corridors. In addition to the more specifically recommended new and upgraded roadways discussed above, the major corridors indicate areas within the county that should be looked at a more macro-scale to better facilitate a countywide transportation network. The identified corridors are opportunities to create consistent, large-scale east-west and north-south thoroughfares where traffic can travel more quickly and consistently, all the while capitalizing on the routes that currently exist. The corridors, in general, aim to use what already exists within the county to elevate mobility without constructing an entirely new roadway system.

At this scale, recommendations about where major corridors should be are general in nature and represent areas that should be considered for upgrade upon further study. Specifically, these recommendations focus on creating major corridors at the following locations:

- Potential new bridge connection across the Missouri River somewhere north of K-5 to facilitate an additional access point from Main Street to I-435;
- Realign K-5 to follow Dempsey Road before heading north on K-7 to provide better access to I-435 on the south side by removing the “jog” it currently follows through Leavenworth County;
- As previously discussed, utilize key upgrades to transform 222nd Street/Tonganoxie Road from the Kansas River to Amelia Earhart Road/K-7 into a major north-south corridor; and
- Similar to 222nd Street/Tonganoxie Road, take advantage of the proposed improvements along Dempsey Road to create an east-west connection that alleviates pressure from existing routes while adding to the network.
Capitalize on the access to rail and water transport along the southern and eastern edges of the county to facilitate economic development. Leavenworth County is uniquely situated, bordered by the Missouri and Kansas Rivers, as well as the Union Pacific Railroad, and BNSF Railroad. Although the Transportation Plan concentrates on the roadway network, other modes of transportation must not be forgotten. While the transportation system facilitates economic development by trucking freight, the railroads and waterways contribute to the economy, as well. Leavenworth County offers plenty of business opportunities in a wide variety of industries, which makes it that much more important to capitalize on the entire transportation system.

According to the Association of American Railroads, in 2017 alone, America’s major freight railroads supported 1.1 million jobs, nearly $220 billion in output, and $71 billion in wages across the U.S. economy. Although a nationwide statistic, this level of productivity trickles into local economies, especially those with as great of access as Leavenworth County enjoys.

Regarding water movements, the Leavenworth County Port Authority (LCPA) is a quasi-governmental agency that was originally established in 1969 to provide guidance and direction for the development of the port area along the Missouri and Kansas Rivers. As economic development opportunities in the county have trended away from barge and rail importance, the LCPA has adapted to serve additional economic development needs. Now, the LCPA’s mission is to assist in the development of economic opportunities through the planning, construction, and marketing of industrial properties and facilities in Leavenworth County.

Accommodate future transportation technologies, including the impacts of autonomous vehicles (AVs). As technology progresses, integration of new modes, such as connected vehicles (meaning vehicles that communicate with nearby vehicles and infrastructure) and automated vehicles (meaning vehicles that operate with varying degrees of autonomy with varying degrees of driver dependence) should be considered as connections are facilitated. Although AVs, including trucks, may seem far off, this emerging technology is already on America’s roadways and the plans to expand this type of transportation are aggressive.

Integration of AV technology into the transportation system could increase productivity, facilitate freight movements more efficiently, and create new employment opportunities. Additionally, this technology could increase access to transportation for traditionally underserved communities, particularly the elderly and people with disabilities. A critical component of the future of AV technology is maintaining good infrastructure, including pavement conditions, signing, and pavement marking, such that the connected and AVs can more reliably function alongside existing traffic.
Coordinate transportation planning efforts with other planning projects within Leavenworth County, especially the County Road 1 Land Use Analysis. A best practice in planning is always to coordinate efforts to ensure no policies, practices, or recommendations are being made in a vacuum. Although this Plan aims to bring together all the pieces of the puzzle, there are other topical studies that will happen on an ongoing basis that must be compared to the recommendations of not only the Plan at large, but also the Transportation Plan as it relates to connectivity, circulation, and mobility. As new studies or planning efforts are underway, the Transportation Plan should be referenced to either be modified to adjust to the most up-to-date information or to inform other planning efforts.

Proposed zoning for the CR-1 corridor (see Figure 5.2) is being considered by the Board of County Commissioners, as of the creation of this document. Although the proposed zoning does not address new roads, the County Road 1 Land Use Analysis did indicate proposed roadway alignments to accommodate future development associated with the updated zoning. Although the transportation element of CR-1 has not yet been formalized, when the time comes, it will be important to consider both efforts. Figure 5.1 shows 222nd Street/Tonganoxie Road as a potential new/upgraded major corridor. This route runs directly through the CR-1 planning area and opportunities to improve upon the corridor as development ensues will capitalize on the congruent planning efforts. Further, as the land uses and development come to fruition and circulator roads are necessary to facilitate transportation, Figure 5.1 should be consulted to ensure the efforts are complementary.
Implement the Kansas City Regional Bike Plan planned regional bike trails. As previously stated, the planned regional bike trail component shown on the Transportation Plan is part of a regional effort to create a cohesive network of bikeways connected across city, county, and state borders. Concentrated along roadway corridors, the planned regional bike trails are strategically dispersed throughout Leavenworth County in a pattern intended to make the most ideal connections to other municipalities. These regional trails thus offer the greatest opportunity for bicycle commuting to and from destinations as they truly facilitate long-distance, meaningful connections to activity centers. Mainly, the bike trails aim to do the following:

- Maximize connections between population and employment centers along multijurisdictional corridors;
- Connect the regional system to national and statewide trail systems; and,
- Provide connections across the region between urban and city centers, as well as smaller communities.

Although there is an existing bike community within Leavenworth County currently, implementation of this network would create a dedicated, official, and consistent system that not only serves as a recreational opportunity for residents and visitors alike, but as a viable transportation method that serves as an alternate to driving.

It is important to note that build out of this system could span many decades and is dependent upon the effort and willingness of local entities, like Leavenworth County and its cities, to implement and finance. MARC provides guidance and fiscal support when possible; however, as seen in Figure 5.3, most of the bikeways within Leavenworth County are listed as a low priority level. **It is critical that bike users of all levels and interest are considered in trails planning - from the “interested, but concerned” with a low stress tolerance with biking conditions to the “highly confident” with a high street tolerance for biking conditions.**

As is visible on Figure 5.3, the highest priority bikeways start in the center of downtown Kansas City where there is much existing infrastructure as well as high activity, and then work their way out into the other cities and counties. This indicates a greater need for Leavenworth County to locally support the regional bikeway system such that the county is well connected to the parts of the system that are being prioritized.

The plan includes planning level cost estimates per-mile cost of bikeway to help entities with planning. As is the case with all planning level estimates, the prices provided are approximations with many factors. As such, the facility estimated cost per mile varies widely, ranging from $2,900 for the most basic improvement of adding signage to an existing route, to over $470,000 for more robust improvements, including construction and/or road widening. However, there are ways to reduce these costs. One example would be to adopt a policy that every time a street is constructed or reconstructed, bicycle accommodations should be implemented.

Further, if the street project includes the necessary width for the bikeway, such as a gravel shoulder for the paving of a bike lane, the true marginal cost for the bikeway is significantly less. The most important thing to remember, though, is that the funding and subsequent implementation of these bikeways within Leavenworth County capitalize on a much larger system that makes the impact of the local routes far more meaningful than if they had been built as a single system. This integration and cooperative effort across municipal boundaries will create an alternative transportation system that spans the Kansas City metropolitan area.

---

**Trails have a positive impact on communities, including the following quantitative and qualitative benefits:**

- Increase physical and social connectivity, encouraging healthy living and reducing medical costs;
- Provide a safe means of travel for residents;
- Add an amenity that influence the places people choose to live, as well as support the increase of property values;
- Increase tourism by drawing users from outside the community inside, which increase commerce and supports jobs at local businesses; and
- Influence business location and relocation decisions; companies often choose to locate where a high level of amenities is available to employees as a means of attracting and retaining top level workers.
Figure 23 | The Demand Score Map was created through use of the plan’s Demand Model and helps identify priority, unimproved bikeway corridors in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand Miles</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>868</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.3 Regional Bikeway Priorities

Above: Prioritized bikeways throughout the Kansas City metropolitan region (Kansas City Regional Bike Plan [2015])
Implement the MetroGreen Regional Greenway System planned trails and proposed trails to enhance the countywide trail system. A 2019 study, “Investing in Our Future,” estimated the human health, environmental, and economic benefits of completing the East Coast Greenway, which passes through Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The study found that the benefits of the trail amount to 10 times the costs of completing it, infusing approximately three billion dollars annually just for the sections local to Philadelphia. Although Philadelphia as a municipality is not a good comparison to Leavenworth County, the data still stands: the benefits of trails are considerable. These outdoor recreation systems bring together community members, connect people to the rural heritage and natural scenery of the county, provide appreciation for environmental resources, and promote health and wellbeing, all of which contribute to a higher quality of life.

The MetroGreen Regional Greenway System offers a gateway to creating a countywide network of trails along streamway corridors and abandoned rail lines to realize these benefits for Leavenworth County residents and visitors. Implementing the MetroGreen system alongside the additional proposed trail recommendations featured on the Transportation Plan will not only create a physical trail system, but also support the biological diversity of streams, rivers, and lakes through:

- Specifying waterways to be used for recreational purposes;
- Offering watershed strategies for flood control and protecting natural stream corridors;
- Recommending local adoption of streamside buffer zones; and,
- Restoring native habitat for indigenous plants and animals.

In this way, implementation of the trails plays a role in conservation and restoration, too, by physically protecting riparian corridors while providing a means for people to appreciate and understand the importance of preserving these precious resources. The trail system is intentionally designed to connect with the bikeways, creating a multimodal network not only within Leavenworth County, but within the greater Kansas City Metropolitan area. As opportunities present themselves for the county to set aside funding for this system, it is recommended the trails system be implemented to facilitate this region-wide network.

Align future transit decisions with development patterns while maintaining existing service to senior populations. A recurring theme throughout the public engagement process when discussing transit included much praise for the existing Leavenworth County Council on Aging service. This service provides transportation to those ages 60 and above, meal delivery, and a host of other personal services to ensure seniors receive the care and transportation they need and want. The public indicated that additional transit services are not needed or desired at this time as the Leavenworth County Council on Aging is meeting current demand for transit. However, as Figure 4.1 is realized, there may be a need for enhanced offerings to ensure there are multiple options to reach destinations.

At the time of this Plan’s writing, transit offerings are meeting transit demand. To ensure that Leavenworth County residents maintain this optimal mobility into the future, transit should be evaluated on an ongoing basis. As developments are constructed, particularly those with employment centers, retail services, and entertainment, it will be important to look at the transportation network holistically. A diverse transportation system allows residents to age in place, access jobs, goods, and services, all of which contribute to a healthy economy.
Section 6

Community Facilities and Infrastructure Plan

Leavenworth County has a well-established network of community facilities and infrastructure that support everyday life. These networks are focused on the areas surrounding the cities and exist only sporadically throughout the more rural extents of the county. Substantial growth in unincorporated areas of the county may place a burden on the county as the need for infrastructure and services expands.

Moving forward, Leavenworth County must plan for future development and growth by establishing a new direction for the expansion of infrastructure to meet the demands and pressures that come with an increased population. This section provides targets and strategies that help achieve measured and sustainable growth within the county that also honor the county’s rural heritage.

Targets and Strategies

**Targets** are what the county would like to accomplish; they are the big ideas to move the county forward for the next 10 to 20 years. Targets are more qualitative than quantitative and answer the “what” rather than the “how.”

**Strategies** present an approach or method for reaching or exceeding the targets. Strategies answer the “how” and can be broken down into tasks for individual organizations and/or responsible parties.
Figure 6.1
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Utility Infrastructure Context Map

Figure 6.1 provides a picture of the existing utilities and their context within the county, including areas serviced by a water district, water lines, transmission lines, and watersheds. As will be discussed in the strategies, a dedicated utility master plan is necessary to adequately address the provision of utility services at this scale. Therefore, Figure 6.1 provides a countywide look at what presently exists to provide context in this section.

Targets

1. Provide utility infrastructure in an efficient and effective manner that meets current and future needs and can facilitate and adapt to county growth.

2. Continue to plan for and provide public safety facilities and services that protect the health, livelihood, and property of current and future county residents.

3. Increase general support for and all residents’ access to healthcare systems to encourage greater health and well-being throughout all stages of life.

4. Increase the diversity of the county’s energy portfolio to reduce reliance on fossil fuels.
Strategies

Develop a utility master plan that fully assesses the county’s utility infrastructure including current conditions, expected lifespan, reliability, and expansion strategies that align with projected growth. Leavenworth County must fully assess the current state and future growth of utility services available to county residents through a utility master planning process. Though this Plan provides a high-level review of Leavenworth County’s utility services, a utility master plan would dive deep into water, wastewater, power, natural gas, and telecommunications infrastructure to assess strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the systems, establish the needs as future development occurs, and recommend a course of action to ensure that utility infrastructure can meet current and projected demand. The county’s Geographic Information System must include up-to-date utility data to understand where existing utilities are.

Of particular importance in a utility master plan is a deep dive into the future of wastewater treatment countywide. Formal wastewater treatment systems are currently found in or near municipalities. High-density rural residential developments are serviced by central treatment options that are operated and maintained by the individual subdivision. As the county grows and develops, wastewater must be studied further, with three leading options:

1. Coordinate and plan with all wastewater systems to develop a long-range plan to provide needed collection/pumping/treatment systems for development outside of current proposed municipal growth areas (e.g., specific, targeted improvements);
2. Develop a countywide wastewater system that absorbs all existing collection/treatment systems (e.g., countywide improvements); or,
3. Develop area-specific wastewater systems to address future sewer needs (e.g., drainage basins).

In addition to the facilitation of the actual utility master plan, a Cost of Services study should be conducted alongside the effort. A Cost of Services study would review the cost to the county of providing utility services to proposed land uses within the county (see Figure 4.1). Understanding the cost associated with the provision of utility infrastructure based on the type of development helps shape the conversation and decision-making about how to meet the demands of a development while ensuring the county is set up for long-term success.

Lastly, coordination between the county, municipalities, and utility companies should take place on an ongoing basis to ensure utility infrastructure is properly maintained and residents are receiving quality service.
Study and enhance public safety services to ensure all life and property within Leavenworth County is adequately protected. Public safety is an essential portion of the services provided by the county and includes law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical services. As such, the county should complete a public safety master plan to ensure the residents of the county are adequately protected by these essential services.

A public safety master plan should analyze the following:
- Current demand for law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical services, including calls for service and other workload demands;
- Staff resources in all departments (how they are deployed and utilized to understand personnel gaps);
- Current operations and opportunities analysis to improve the delivery of services;
- Current management systems and approach to overseeing and controlling the operations of public safety departments; and,
- Feasibility of alternative approaches to providing police, fire, and emergency medical services.

A planning effort of this type allows the county to evaluate where its provision of services is adequately covering residents and identify gaps in service. With a study of this type, the county will be better equipped to prepare for and respond to natural disasters and emergency situations. To address these occurrences, it is recommended that – in addition to a public safety master plan – the county actively rely upon and utilize the Kansas Homeland Security Region L Hazard Mitigation Plan (2019-2024) as a best practice in emergency management. Region L includes Johnson, Leavenworth, and Wyandotte counties, but the plan addresses each jurisdiction individually, assessing risk and providing mitigation strategies and ways to implement and maintain the plan.

Be open to opportunities for renewable energy to illustrate Leavenworth County’s commitment to the environment while reducing reliance on non-renewable resources. According to the Kansas Corporation Commission, fossil fuels currently generate most of the electricity produced in Kansas; however, the use of renewable energy - including wind and solar - continues to expand. In fact, the Renewable Energy Standards Act (RESA) establishes a statewide renewable energy standard for Kansas, which is a voluntary goal that 20 percent of a utility's peak demand within the state be generated from renewable energy resources by the year 2020. Although not required, RESA indicates a statewide push toward the integration of renewable resources into energy portfolios.

There are many opportunities for incorporating renewable energy into the county as a viable alternative to traditional power source, including:
- Wind;
- Solar thermal sources;
- Photovoltaic cells and panels;
- Dedicated crops grown for energy production;
- Cellulosic agricultural residues;
- Plant residues;
- Methane from landfills or wastewater treatment;
- Clean and untreated wood products, such as pallets;
- Existing and new hydropower;
- Fuel cells using hydrogen produced by one of the above-named renewable energy resources; and,
- Energy storage that is connected to any renewable generation by means of energy storage equipment including, but not limited to, batteries, fly wheels, compressed air storage and pumped hydro.

With the abundant agricultural land and open space in Leavenworth County, renewable energy is more feasible than in other, more developed counties. For example, wind turbines have a relatively low impact on farmland productivity, soil health, or grazing animals while still offering ample space to accommodate the equipment. Further, Leavenworth County has a unique opportunity to grow crops strictly for energy production.

On a smaller scale, the county could encourage homeowners, business owners, and developers to use renewable energy on their personal properties and/or projects. Encouraging this type of building operation and design supports the recommended efforts of conservation site design previously discussed.
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Section 7

Implementation

This section of the Plan sets forth specific actions that various departments, bodies, and organizations should take to move the Plan’s recommendations forward. Such actions are organized by topic and strategy, and then evaluated by multiple considerations. Short-, mid-, and long-term processes, policies, plans, and programs that advance one or more targets of the Plan are assessed. This section should be used as a decision-making tool as county staff, vested organizations, and elected officials consider land use-, development-, and infrastructure-related issues.
Overview

Although planning is a fluid and continuous process, adoption of this Plan begins a long and collaborative journey of implementing the recommendations. This comprehensive plan provides a road map for growth, development, and connectivity that has been vetted by the community and validated by county staff members and county officials. Of all the work that occurred to make this Plan a reality, this section is perhaps the most important as it demonstrates the "how." With the research and analysis that occurred, the community engagement that took place, and interactive work sessions with county staff members and elected officials, now it is time to put the Plan to work. Adoption of this Plan is the first step into the future of putting the recommendations into action to realize the vision.

Integral to each implementation step are the following overarching strategies:

### Day-to-Day Use
The Plan should be used daily, as the official policy guide for land use, development, transportation.

### Cooperation and Coordination
Open lines of communication with each municipality and the public must be maintained. Coordinating strategies, projects, and policies are critical to proactively execute the Plan.

### Start with Policy
Establishing policy creates the essential framework for future implementation of the Plan. Oftentimes, policy changes can be made quickly and for a minimal cost.

### Be Bold, Visible, and Conversational
Early "wins" and visible projects help garner the endorsement of the public. Spread the word to market and celebrate early successes through multiple outlets to gain support and momentum for long-term ventures.

### Identify Plan Champions
Those persons involved in the planning process must continue to champion the Plan over time to maximize success. Continue communications with the SCAC.
Action Plan

This subsection utilizes several implementation matrices to clearly lay out the next steps that will move the Plan forward. One implementation matrix outlines holistic measures that should be considered across all recommendations. For instance, communicating the Plan’s recommendations to the public and municipalities is an overarching implementation measure that stretches across all targets and strategies.

In addition, an implementation matrix is provided for different topics. Each of these respective matrices will have specific tasks that relate to that topic. Although there is inherent overlap, these measures will be most specifically related to the topic at hand.

The implementation matrices are broken down by strategies and tasks. Every strategy is analyzed by identifying its “owner,” other participants; time frame for completion; overall impact to safety, infrastructure, quality of life, and economic development; and barriers to implementation. Each strategy is broken down into actionable tasks. Tasks are analyzed by identifying its category (process, policy, program, or plan); “owner,” other participants; and cost impact.

The purpose of providing this level of detail is to ensure each strategy is viewed through the lens of political, economic, and community reality, but also properly weighed against the widespread benefits. The definitions of each analysis topic are provided as follows.

**Category**

Each task can be categorized as a process, policy, plan, or program.

- **Process:** Tasks that set forth actions for (primarily) county planning department staff members to continue throughout the life of the Plan
- **Policy:** Tasks that can be achieved by making and implementing county policy changes
- **Plan:** Tasks that are centered on the need for additional study, and therefore recommend the development of a separate plan
- **Program:** Tasks that describe a set of related measures or activities with a long-term aim and a set schedule and plan

**Strategy/Task Owner and Participants**

Although the entire public should feel an investment in the Plan’s advancement, elected officials, county staff members, and certain organizations have a vested responsibility when it comes to Plan implementation. Both strategy/task owners and strategy/task participants are responsible to ensure the Plan does not sit idle.

- **Strategy/Task Owner:** Those that are charged with leading implementation of the specific strategy and/or task; shown in **BOLD** text
- **Strategy/Task Participants:** Those that are also involved in the implementation of the action item and provide support to the strategy/task owner

**Time Frame**

While some strategies/tasks should be started immediately and/or continued over time to continue building the Plan’s momentum, other strategies/tasks should be planned for and implemented within the next one to five years.

- **Immediately:** (0-1 year) Ease of implementation, directly advances other strategies/tasks, and/or addresses critical issues
- **Continuous:** (Ongoing over Plan lifetime) Necessary strategies/tasks to sustain the Plan
- **Short-Term:** (1-5 years) With appropriate planning, can be implemented within this time frame
Four categories of impact were considered for the recommended strategies. Each impact category is rated either low, medium, or high. The categories are as follows:

- **Enhanced Safety**: Enhances the safety of the county's transportation system, structures, and operations
- **Resilient and Supportive Infrastructure**: Provides for a resilient and efficient transportation and utility physical infrastructure system that will serve county residents and county growth now and into the future
- **Improved Quality of Life**: Improves county residents’ health and diversity of choices (in entertainment, living, shopping, dining, recreation, etc.)
- **Sustained Economic Growth**: Increases potential and sustainable economic growth through development, business recruitment and/or retention, and resident and visitor appeal

Three categories of barriers to implementation were considered for the recommended strategies. Each barrier category is rated either low, medium, or high. The categories are as follows:

- **Necessary Amount of Political Will**: If a task requires a low amount of political will, the task’s barriers to implementation decrease, as little convincing, marketing, etc. is necessary to gain the public’s and elected official’s support. If a task requires a high amount of political will, the task’s barriers to implementation increase, as effort must be spent meeting with elected officials, gathering community input, etc.
- **Number of Involved Parties**: If a task requires a low number of parties (people, bodies, departments, and organizations) to be involved, the task’s barriers to implementation decrease, as little coordination between groups is necessary. If a task requires a high number of parties to be involved, the task’s barriers to implementation increase, as much coordination between groups is necessary.
- **Cost Impact**: If a task has a low cost impact, the task requires limited outside funding requirements and/or a limited public dollars, which decreases the task’s barriers to implementation. If a task has a high cost impact, the task requires heightened levels of outside funding and/or public dollars, which increases the task’s barriers to implementation. Note that cost impact does not account for private investment costs.
Holistic Implementation Measures

This implementation matrix, Table 7.1, includes items that comprehensively address all recommendations of the Plan. These items set the stage for the advancement of topical implementation measures. Additionally, items listed in Table 7.1 ensure the Plan’s sustainability as time goes on as they provide the framework necessary for the topical implementation measures to be successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 1 ADOPT THE UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Political Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>No. of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Cost Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 2: AMEND RELEVANT REGULATIONS AND PLANS</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 2 Tasks</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a thorough review of the existing zoning and subdivision regulations and compile a comprehensive list of changes (with exact policy text) necessary to align county zoning and subdivision regulations with the intent of the Plan</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a thorough review of the existing plans, such as the U.S. 24/40 Corridor Study, and compile a comprehensive list of changes (with exact policy text) necessary to align the plans with the intent of the Plan</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Public Works Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate changes with county residents through the Planning and Zoning Department’s webpage on the county website</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present proposed plan amendments to the Planning Commission for recommendation of approval and to the County Commission for approval</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Holistic Implementation Measures Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 3: USE THE PLAN ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Public Works Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 4: REVIEW THE PLAN PERIODICALLY AND STRATEGICALLY; PREPARE AN ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Leavenworth County Development Corporation, Public Works Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy 3 Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy 4 Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Leavenworth County Development Corporation</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Public Works Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Strategy Owner and Participants</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Overall Impact To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 5: Educate Elected Officials, County Departments, Local Municipalities, and the Public</strong></td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Public Works Dep’t, County Administrator, Municipalities, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 5 Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a work session with Planning Commission and County Commission to educate them on the findings and recommendations of the Plan as leadership changes; prepare a key takeaways document for easy reference after the presentation</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with relevant department heads and local municipal leaders to explain the findings and recommendations of the Plan; prepare a succinct presentation and provide a copy of it to the department heads and local municipal leaders</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Public Works Dep’t, County Administrator, Municipalities, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately (and as leadership changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make copies of the Plan available online for free and provide hard copies at the County Courthouse for purchase</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid the public in explaining the Plan and its relationship to private and public development projects and other proposals, as appropriate</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft a summary document that includes key recommendations from the Plan that can be distributed to residents, developers, businesses, and other interested parties</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Strategy 6: Widely Communicate and Market the Plan to Celebrate the Plan’s Successes | Planning & Zoning Dep’t | Continuous | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| **Strategy 6 Tasks** | | | | | | | | | |
| Post the final Plan on the city’s and county’s website | Process | Planning & Zoning Dep’t | Immediately | Low |
| Provide a copy of the Plan to each county department | Process | Planning & Zoning Dep’t | Immediately | Low |
| Regularly maintain and update the Plan website (www.lvcountyplan.com) with progress and changes; utilize the email marketing tool integration to send update emails out to the contact list | Program | Planning & Zoning Dep’t | Continuous | Low |
| Post updates related to the Plan on the county’s social media accounts | Program | Planning & Zoning Dep’t | Continuous | Low |
| Utilize the developed project branding style guide to ensure a consistent look and feel in Plan-related messaging | Process | Planning & Zoning Dep’t | Continuous | Low |
## Holistic Implementation Measures Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 7: DEVELOP STRONG RELATIONSHIPS WITH IMPLEMENTATION PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Leavenworth County Development Corporation, Leavenworth County Port Authority, Leavenworth County Council on Aging, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategy 7 Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 7 Tasks</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure open communication lines between the county and vital implementation partner organizations, such as the Leavenworth County Development Corporation, Leavenworth County Port Authority, and Leavenworth County Council on Aging</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Leavenworth County Development Corporation, Leavenworth County Port Authority, Leavenworth County Council on Aging, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather demographic and market insight and research from implementation partner organizations to avoid duplicative efforts as the Plan is updated to reflect changing conditions</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Leavenworth County Development Corporation, Leavenworth County Port Authority, Leavenworth County Council on Aging, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Topical Implementation Measures

The implementation matrices that follow, Tables 7.2-7.4, describe specific measures that must be taken to advance the topic at hand. Land use, economic development, transportation, and infrastructure are inherently linked and the efforts taken to address items in these categories should complement one another; however, it is important – from an implementation standpoint – to understand what must occur in each of these areas for progress to be made. Opportunities to overlap projects exist, such as a redevelopment project that lends itself to a roadway improvement.

### Table 7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRATEGY 1: CREATE COMMERCIAL AND MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT PLANS WITH INCENTIVES ALONG IDENTIFIED KEY CORRIDORS AND AT SPECIFIC INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Safety: Low, Infrastructure: Low, Quality of Life: Medium, Economics: High</td>
<td>Political Will: Medium, No. of Parties: Medium, Cost Impact: Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy 1 Tasks**

- Prepare incentive plans and assistance packages to spur the development of the U.S. 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie; the intersection of U.S. 24/40 and CR-1; and 155th Street between Basehor and Lansing; the package should detail the proposed uses on the site, as well as the site’s advantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Consider preparing a Request for Proposal for the above mentioned corridors and intersections to send to interested developers; the RFP should detail the available incentive and assistance package; high standards for site and building design should be required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Use the county’s existing online mapping software to show the spatial location of available properties and incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.2: Land Use and Economic Development Implementation Measures Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 2: UPDATE THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT CATEGORIES AND REVIEW AND MONITORING PROCESS</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, County Attorney, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Policy, Safety, Infrastructure, Quality of Life, Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 3: INTEGRATE A “LAND FIRST” APPROACH INTO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCESS, AND A CLEAR ANALYSIS OF SUCH AN APPROACH INTO COUNTY PLANNING STAFF REPORTS</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Policy, Safety, Infrastructure, Quality of Life, Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy 2 Tasks

- **Create a tiered review and approval system for special uses within the county with different categories of special uses, dependent on their scale, use, and potential impact on the health, safety, welfare, and property values of surrounding properties, using page 81 of this Plan as a guide**
  
  **Category**: Policy  
  **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, County Attorney, Commissioners  
  **Time Frame**: Immediately  
  **Cost Impact**: Low

- **Consider longer approval terms for lower class special uses within the county**
  
  **Category**: Policy  
  **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners  
  **Time Frame**: Immediately  
  **Cost Impact**: Low

- **Integrate the Land Evaluation component of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system into the special use permit review process, as spelled out in the county’s zoning and subdivision regulations, to identify areas of and protect the most productive farmland**
  
  **Category**: Policy  
  **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep’t  
  **Time Frame**: Immediately  
  **Cost Impact**: Low

#### Strategy 3 Tasks

- **Update the county’s zoning and subdivision regulations to include graphic examples and descriptive text that illustrates conservation design principles, as described on page 82**
  
  **Category**: Process  
  **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners  
  **Time Frame**: Short-Term  
  **Cost Impact**: Low

- **Work with and educate development review applicants on ways to incorporate conservation design principles into their development proposals**
  
  **Category**: Process  
  **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners  
  **Time Frame**: Continuous  
  **Cost Impact**: Low

- **Consider the use of incentives to encourage applicants to incorporate conservation design principles into their development proposals**
  
  **Category**: Policy  
  **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep’t, Commissioners  
  **Time Frame**: Continuous  
  **Cost Impact**: Low
### Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan

#### Table 7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 4: DEVELOP AND ADOPT AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIC PLAN</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy 4 Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify funding for an economic development strategic plan</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a scope of services for an economic development strategic plan that includes a regional market assessment, opportunity and barrier assessment, target industry sector analysis, regional and target industry positioning, economic development goals and policies, and stakeholder input</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a county economic development strategic plan with robust stakeholder input</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider regional and municipal economic development activities in the economic development strategic plan</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Development Corporation Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 5: CREATE AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ROUNDTABLE</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Leavenworth County Development Corporation, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 5 Tasks</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify critical participants, including public, private, and nonprofit partners, in the economic development roundtable to be part of the first line of communication between businesses and local government and subsequent recommendations to the Planning Commission and County Commission</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Leavenworth County Development Corporation, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize the economic development roundtable’s meeting schedule, member responsibilities, and goals, as they relate to business recruitment and retention; workforce development and training; marketing; regional collaboration; and strategic economic development planning</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Leavenworth County Development Corporation</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in online mapping software that can be integrated into the county’s website in order to show the spatial location of available properties and incentives</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, County Administrator, Leavenworth County Development Corporation</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Development Resources

Leavenworth County Development Corporation (LCDC)
The LCDC is a coalition for economic growth in the Leavenworth, Lansing, Tonganoxie, and Basehor communities, mobilizing business, government, and civic leaders. The public-private partnership gives companies access to partner investment for starting up, relocating, or expanding.

Leavenworth County Port Authority (LCPA)
Originally focused on development in the port area along the Missouri and Kansas Rivers, the LCPA is a quasi-governmental agency whose focus is economic development opportunities with industrial properties and facilities. The LCPA is staffed by the Leavenworth County Development Corporation (LCDC).

AltCap Low Interest Loan Fund for Businesses Affected by COVID-19
On March 31st, 2020, AltCap launched a community-backed five million dollar small business relief loan fund, supported by the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, the Kansas City Area Development Council (KCADC), the Civic Council of Great Kansas City, and the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. In order to qualify for a relief loan, small businesses must be located in the Kansas City metropolitan area (including Leavenworth County); have 20 or fewer full-time equivalent employees, and have $2.5 million or less in annual revenue.

Broadband Initiative / Kansas Universal Service Fund
Created by the 1996 Telecommunications Act, the purpose of the Kansas Universal Service Fund is to assure that quality communication services are available for all Kansans, including local businesses and rural area networks. All telecommunications companies contribute a percentage of all intrastate retail revenues to the fund, which is then distributed back to designated eligible local carriers.

Small Cities Community Development Block Grant
The CBDG economic development program is a source of financing for companies that are expanding or relocating to a non-metropolitan area of Kansas. Up to $750,000 is available per project. In order to obtain funds, the county governing body applies on behalf of the private business.

U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA)
The U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) partners with entities to develop and disseminate tools on new and emerging economic development concepts that practitioners and policymakers can utilize to make more informed development decisions. They focus on areas such as identifying areas of distress and competitive advantage; pinpointing regional clusters; measuring the triple bottom line and innovation capacity; analyzing investments; and more.
### Table 7.3

#### Strategy: Develop and Adopt a Transportation Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep't, County Administrator, Public Works Dep't, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategy 1 Tasks

- **Allocate funding for a transportation master plan in the county’s upcoming budget cycle**
  - **Category**: Plan
  - **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't, Commissioners
  - **Time Frame**: Immediately
  - **Cost Impact**: Medium

- **Prepare a scope of services for a transportation master plan that covers all modes of transportation, including maintenance of roads (including paving guidelines), road construction or upgrades, trails, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, transit, freight, railroads, and aviation; attention should be placed on funding**
  - **Category**: Process
  - **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep't, County Administrator, Public Works Dep't, Commissioners
  - **Time Frame**: Immediately
  - **Cost Impact**: Low

- **The transportation master plan should take into consideration regional and municipal planning activities, including but not limited to the Kansas City Regional Bike Plan, MetroGreen Regional Greenway System, KDOT planned improvements, MARC’s Regional Transportation Plan 2050, KCATA transit plans, and Leavenworth County's Council on Aging**
  - **Category**: Process
  - **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't, KDOT, KCATA, MARC, Leavenworth County Council on Aging, Commissioners
  - **Time Frame**: Short-Term
  - **Cost Impact**: Low

- **Use the recommendations illustrated on Figure 5.1 Transportation Plan as a starting point for the transportation master plan**
  - **Category**: Process
  - **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't, Commissioners
  - **Time Frame**: Short-Term
  - **Cost Impact**: Low

- **Following existing conditions analysis, public engagement, and formulation of transportation recommendations, present the master plan to the Planning Commission for recommendation of adoption and to the County Commission for adoption**
  - **Category**: Process
  - **Task Owner and Participants**: Planning & Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't, Commissioners
  - **Time Frame**: Short-Term
  - **Cost Impact**: Low

### Strategy 2: Improve Connectivity in the County’s Transportation Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy 2 Tasks</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Align transportation improvements with development and redevelopment projects to link activity centers with appropriate roadway infrastructure</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Public Works Dep't, Planning &amp; Zoning Dep't, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly coordinate with the Leavenworth County Port Authority to address barge and rail operations and determine their role in the regional transportation network</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning Dep't, Public Works Dep't, Leavenworth County Port Authority</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.3: Transportation and Mobility Implementation Matrix (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRAEGY 3: UPDATE THE COUNTY’S ROAD STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 3 Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and potentially update the county road standards, based on best management practices, peer county practices, and FHWA guidance</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly (every one to three years) review the updated county road standards and revise them to follow national best practices</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRAEGY 4: ACTIVELY COORDINATE WITH OTHER MUNICIPALITIES ON THE COUNTY ROADWAY SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, KDOT, Municipalities</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 4 Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host quarterly transportation meetings with representatives from each municipality’s public works department, as well as KDOT, to ensure a coordinated strategy for the incorporated and unincorporated roadways</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, KDOT, Municipalities</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactively communicate with municipalities about the updated county road standards</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Municipalities</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRAEGY 5: MONITOR TRANSIT NEEDS COUNTYWIDE</strong></td>
<td>Leavenworth County Council on Aging, Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, KCATA</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy 5 Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet annually with KCATA to evaluate how well the current transit system is meeting demand</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Council on Aging, Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t, KCATA</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue allocating appropriate funds to operate the Leavenworth County’s Council on Aging on-demand meals and transportation service to seniors</td>
<td>Program?</td>
<td>Leavenworth County Council on Aging, Planning &amp; Zoning Dep’t</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Community Services and Infrastructure Implementation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategy Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Overall Impact To</th>
<th>Barriers to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRATEGY 1: DEVELOP AND ADOPT A UTILITY MASTER PLAN</strong></td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, County Administrator, Municipalities, Utility Providers, Planning &amp; Zoning Dept, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategy 1 Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task Owner and Participants</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Cost Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocate funding for a utility master plan in the county’s upcoming budget cycle</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Planning &amp; Zoning Dept, County Administrator, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a scope of services for a utility master plan that covers all utilities, including water, wastewater, stormwater, and energy</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Planning &amp; Zoning Dept, County Administrator, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider hiring a consultant to draft the utility master plan or dedicate staff time to perform the study in-house</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Planning &amp; Zoning Dept, County Administrator, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low / Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following existing conditions analysis, public engagement, and formulation of utility master plan recommendations, present the Plan to the Planning Commission for recommendation of adoption and to the County Commission for adoption</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Planning &amp; Zoning Dept, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform a Cost of Services study to understand the cost associated with the provision of utility infrastructure based on development type</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Planning &amp; Zoning Dept, Commissioners</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host regular coordination meetings between the county, municipalities, and utility providers to ensure utility infrastructure is properly maintained and residents receive quality service</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Public Works Dep’t, Planning &amp; Zoning Dept, County Administrator, Utility Providers, Municipalities, Commissioners</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Funding Mechanisms

The potential funding mechanisms, listed in Table 7.5 below, for the Plan come in several different forms: regulation, taxes, districts, bonds, and grants. It is important to note the objective of securing funding is to pay for improvements that otherwise would not have a source of funding, and to provide seed monies for the encouragement of private investment to occur. There will never be enough public funding to realize the recommendations in the Plan. For this reason, the investment and leverage of private dollars is crucial to the success of the Plan. Unless another entity or organization is clearly charged with recognition, application, and acquisition of funding resources for the implementation of the Plan recommendations, the county should analyze the appropriateness, cost benefits, and best application of these tools as necessary to implement the Plan’s recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>The development applicant pays a fee as a condition of the county’s approval of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAXES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise Tax</td>
<td>A tax levied on a particular activity, measured by the amount of business done or income received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Tax</td>
<td>A tax levied on all sales for the purpose of specifically funding infrastructure and operating expenses within a certain parameter, but also most economic development activities; the revenues cannot be used on retail projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements Tax</td>
<td>A tax levied on all retail sales for the purpose of funding capital improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Sales Tax</td>
<td>A sales tax of one-half percent on all retail sales to generate revenues for transportation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Improvement District (CID)</td>
<td>CIDs derive revenues through special assessments, a district-only sales tax, or other funds as appropriated by the county to finance a variety of locally approved development-related activity, including property acquisition, infrastructure development, and parking and building construction; funds can also extend to improvements outside the district, so long as these are deemed necessary to implement the larger development plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Improvement District (BID)</td>
<td>Individual cities (not counties) can implement BIDs within their jurisdictions to fund a variety of activities to improve, maintain, and promote a designated district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BONDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Obligation Bonds</td>
<td>General obligation bonds are issued with the county’s full faith and credit that are paid by a dedicated amount of property tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>Revenue bonds are issued to finance facilities with a definable user or revenue base; revenue bonds differ from general obligation bonds as they are backed by a specific revenue stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)</td>
<td>The CBDG program is a source of financing for companies that are expanding or relocating to a non-metropolitan area of Kansas; up to $750,000 is available per project; in order to obtain funds, the county governing body applies on behalf of the private business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>The TIP is developed by MARC in cooperation other agencies; the program document is updated every two years to include all major surface transportation projects planned to receive federal, state, and local funding within a five-year period; inclusion in the TIP enables a project to receive and expend federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ)</td>
<td>The CMAQ is a federally funded program administered by MARC for surface transportation projects designed to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)</td>
<td>The STP is a flexible funding program administered by MARC intended to fund a wide variety of projects that address multiple modes of transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBG Set-Aside (formerly Transportation Alternatives Program – TAP)</td>
<td>The TAP, administered by MARC, is intended to create safe, accessible, and environmentally-sensitive communities by providing funding for a variety of active transportation projects that were previously funded through the Transportation Enhancements, Safe Routes to School, and Recreational Trails Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Olsson has been retained to update the Comprehensive Plan for Leavenworth County, Kansas. As a sub-consultant to Olsson, Canyon Research Southwest has prepared an Economic and Market Analysis that evaluates demographic, economic, and real estate market trends impacting urban development patterns in Leavenworth County, Kansas.

Based on the findings of the Economic and Market Analysis, a Market Positioning Strategy for the Planning Area is outlined, including: 1) market opportunities and constraints; 2) long-term demand projections for retail, office and industrial space as well as residential housing units; 3) future land use and development patterns.

Demographic and Economic Trends

Leavenworth County’s urban growth is influenced by its location at the urban fringe of the Kansas City MSA. As the Kansas City region continues to grow Leavenworth County is anticipated to experience accelerated population and job growth, residential and commercial development activity, and increased demands for municipal and transportation services.

By 2040, Leavenworth County is forecast to add approximately 19,000 residents and 8,500 jobs, generating demand for new housing, retail goods and services, eating and drinking establishments, and commercial and industrial space.

Household income levels in Leavenworth County suggest a future need for a wide variety of housing products, including affordable, entry level, and move up housing.

Leavenworth County’s high educational attainment levels bode well for attracting employers and supporting above average income levels, retail expenditures, and housing values and rents.

Leavenworth County’s large Millennial population creates demand for rental housing, clothing, electronics, entertainment, and eating and drinking establishments.

Forecast continued job creation in Leavenworth County will yield a growing demand for professional office, medical office, retail, and industrial space.

Continued growth in tourism expenditures in Leavenworth County will have a positive impact on revenues within the lodging, retail, entertainment, and eating and drinking sectors of the economy.

Leavenworth County possesses ample advantages for attracting businesses, jobs, and development activity. The principal economic development benefit lies within being located at the periphery of a growing regional economy whose assets include a large population; diverse economy, convenient highway, air and rail access; well educated population; and high quality of life. Economic development benefits offered by Leavenworth County include a rural lifestyle, four shovel-ready business parks with low land costs, affordable housing costs, and a well-educated population. Challenges facing future economic development efforts in Leavenworth County include a low unemployment rate that places constraints on the available labor force, lack of rail served business parks, limited inventory of industrial and office space available for immediate occupancy, and stiff competition from other cities within the Kansas City MSA.
Leavenworth County’s four largest cities each maintain distinctive demographic and economic characteristics which should assist in promoting future employment and population growth.

Basehor is a bedroom community situated in closest proximity to the path of the Kansas City MSA urban expansion and has experienced the strongest population growth since 2010. Basehor’s population is well educated, possesses above average income levels, and consists largely of young families. Basehor is anticipated to continue to attract families with above average income levels. Basehor supports very little commerce and employment.

Lansing is a well-educated community supporting the highest income and family household levels among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. Lansing has also experienced the largest population growth in the county since 1980. Lansing supports very little commerce and modest employment levels.

Tonganoxie is within the southwest quadrant of the County and is the County’s fourth largest city with a population of just over 5,500 residents. Despite being located the furthest from the Kansas City MSA’s urban fringe, from 2010 to 2018, Tonganoxie grew by nearly 200 percent, adding 3,660 residents. Of the County’s four largest cities, Tonganoxie supports the lowest rates for family households and households with children, the highest rate of residents age 65 years and over, and the second highest level of educational attainment.

Leavenworth serves as Leavenworth County’s principal commerce and employment center driven by the presence of Fort Leavenworth, VA Medical Center, and Veterans Administration. Despite the large government presence, since 1980 Leavenworth has been the slowest growing community in Leavenworth County. Leavenworth supports a below average rate of family households and above average for people living alone. Educational attainment for Leavenworth mirrors the county average, but the income levels are the lowest among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities.

Real Estate Market Trends

The Leavenworth County retail inventory totals 2.6 million square feet of space with the City of Leavenworth serving as the principal center for retail goods and services. The County’s current inventory of occupied retail space equates to just 31 square feet per capita compared to 56 square feet per capita for the Kansas City MSA. From a high of 6.7 percent in 2017, the County’s retail vacancy rate has reached a healthy 1.8 percent, suggesting short-term new supply is supportable.

Since 2010, Leavenworth County has suffered from considerable retail sales leakage supporting an annual pull factor ranging from 0.54 to 0.59. Leavenworth County’s high rate of retail sales leakage is a symptom of modest population levels, presence at the urban fringe, and proximity to larger and more diverse retail destinations in the Kansas City MSA.

The existing inventory of office space in Leavenworth County totals 957,911 square feet. Since 2015, Leavenworth County has absorbed 116,175 square feet of office space with no new construction reported. As a result, the overall vacancy rate has gradually improved from 15.1 percent in 2015 to 9.7 percent by mid-2019.

Despite the upward trend in office rents since 2013 they yet to reach the level to support construction of speculative space with new development driven by end-user demand.
currently no speculative office space under construction or planned for near-term development in Leavenworth County

By the second quarter 2019 the Leavenworth County industrial market supported 4.22 million square feet of space consisting of 3.6 million square feet of warehouse space, 25,280 square feet of flex space, and 554,194 square feet of specialized industrial space.

Since 2015, Leavenworth County has absorbed 551,246 square feet of industrial space with total new supply limited to 81,000 square feet. Given these market dynamics the County’s overall vacancy rate has declined from 12.0 percent at year-end 2014 to just 0.6 percent by mid-2019. Since 2016, the Leavenworth County industrial market has operated at a vacancy rate of 0.8 percent or less, limiting the ability to support the expansion of existing businesses and attracting new businesses.

Leavenworth County’s housing stock in 2018 was estimated at 29,991 dwelling units. Detached single-family homes account for 77.6 percent of the County’s housing stock with attached multi-family properties with 10+ dwelling units accounting for just 2.7 percent. Leavenworth County’s housing stock mix is influenced by its rural character whereby the demand for detached single-family housing significantly exceeds that for attached rental housing. In terms of housing type, composition, values, and rents, Leavenworth County’s four largest cities cater to very distinctive housing markets. The County’s diverse housing market will assist in capturing employment, population, and urban growth stemming from continued expansion of the Kansas City MSA.

Since 2014, unincorporated Leavenworth County has accounted for a growing volume and market share of countywide single-family home construction. From 54 dwelling units permitting in 2014 and a market share of 24.1 percent, single-family home permitting in unincorporated Leavenworth County reached a high of 96 dwelling units in 2017 for a market share of 36.8 percent. Through year-to-date July 2019, a reported 45 single-family homes were permitted for construction, equating to a 40.9 percent market share.

Nineteen large-scale apartment properties are present in Leavenworth County, totaling 835 dwelling units. By mid-2019 the large-scale apartment properties were operating at a healthy vacancy rate of 4.0 percent and an average rent of $720 per month. No new large-scale apartment properties have been constructed over the past decade. Multi-family properties with 20 or more dwelling units account for only 2.5 percent of the housing stock for both Leavenworth and Lansing with Basehor and Tonganoxie having no large-scale apartments.

Since 2010, Leavenworth County’s median housing value and median monthly rent have consistently exceeded the statewide median. During 2017, the median housing value in Leavenworth County of $171,000 compared to $139,200 for Kansas while the median housing rent of $950 per month exceeded the statewide median of $801 per month.

Leavenworth County’s owner-occupied housing stock is dominated by moderate-priced product with 41.3 percent of the housing valued at $50,000 to $149,999 and 17.0 percent valued at $150,000 to $199,999. Affordable housing valued under $50,000 accounts for 12.7 percent of the County’s housing stock. Conversely, just 14.7 percent of the Leavenworth County housing stock is valued at $300,000 or more.
Market Positioning Strategy

By 2040, Leavenworth County’s population is forecast to increase by approximately 19,183 residents. This increase in population is forecast to generate additional retail sales capable of supporting approximately 594,000 to 674,000 square feet of occupied retail space by 2040.

Office-related job growth through 2040 in Leavenworth County is projected to support the absorption of approximately 307,000 to 345,000 square feet of both owner-occupied and speculative office space.

By 2040, industrial-related job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to support the demand for approximately 1.8 million to 2.2 million square feet of both owner-occupied and speculative industrial space.

Through 2040, new housing demand in Leavenworth County is forecast at 7,080 to 7,325 occupied dwelling units. Owner-occupied housing demand is estimated at 4,815 to 4,980 dwelling units with renter-occupied demand estimated at 2,265 to 2,345 dwelling units.

Forecast Retail, Office, Industrial and Residential Demand
Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2019 to 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019-2040</th>
<th></th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>19,188</td>
<td></td>
<td>594,000 SF</td>
<td>674,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td></td>
<td>307,000 SF</td>
<td>345,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,790,000 SF</td>
<td>2,237,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>19,188</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,080 Units</td>
<td>7,325 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,815 Units</td>
<td>4,980 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,265 Units</td>
<td>2,345 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming an average floor-area-ratio (“FAR”) of 0.2 to 0.4 for the retail, office and industrial space and an average density of 4.0 dwelling units per acre, through 2040 the Leavenworth County is estimated support the development of approximately 1,965 to 2,088 acres of land.

In recent years urban growth within Leavenworth County has largely been influenced by the continued expansion of the Kansas City MSA and its location in the path of growth. Through 2040, urban development and population growth is expected to continue in Leavenworth County, favoring the southern portion of the County.

The communities of Basehor, Tonganoxie, Lansing, and Leavenworth are forecast to capture the bulk of population, employment, and urban growth through the year 2010. The unincorporated areas closest to these cities will also continue to support new home construction and population.
growth. The central and northern portions of the County are expected to remain primarily agricultural.

Leavenworth County’s large land area, natural resources, and transportation system afford the opportunity to create a blend of urban and rural environments that provides the template for Leavenworth County and its principal population and economic centers to adapt to future trends in land use, economics, demographics, and transportation. The goal is to establish a land use plan that allows for continued urban growth and establishes a seamless transition from the County’s existing urban areas into adjacent unincorporated lands. Future urban growth should be sustainable featuring the optimal mix of complimentary land uses, transportation network, infrastructure, economic activity, housing, and land use flexibility. Emphasis should be placed on strengthening the urban centers and retaining the rural character of outlying lands.

To accommodate future development within Leavenworth County urban growth boundaries should be established surrounding the County’s largest cities that extend outside the existing municipal boundaries with emphasis placed on areas where infrastructure currently exists or is planned for expansion. Additional infrastructure investment within the urban growth areas will be required to accommodate future urban growth.

Most of the land designated for residential use within the urban growth areas should consist of low to medium density single-family housing closest to the existing city boundaries and rural residential at the periphery. Attached housing product is suitable adjacent to or in proximity to existing multi-family housing located within the city limits. The balance of the County’s unincorporated land located outside of the urban growth boundaries is best suited for a mix of large lot rural residential and agricultural uses.

Land adjacent to commercial and employment nodes should be designated for mixed density residential uses allowing for a variety of densities for both detached single-family and attached housing product.

Leavenworth County’s future housing stock should provide for a variety of for-sale and rental housing options and price ranges.

Create commercial and employment opportunities designed to ensure Leavenworth County’s long-term economic and fiscal sustainability. Future commercial and employment nodes would be best positioned along major transportation corridors.

The designated urban growth areas should include commercial nodes capable of facilitating a variety of retail development formats. Prospective commercial nodes include: 1) the U.S. Highway 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie; 2) State Highway 7 corridor between Basehor and Lansing; and 3) intersection of U.S. Highway 24 and County Route 1. Neighborhood commercial development opportunities will also occur within the urban growth areas in response to continued new home construction and population growth.

In addition to the four active business parks currently operating in Leavenworth County, prospective future major employment nodes include: 1) the U.S. Highway 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie; 2) County Road 1 corridor north and south of Interstate 70; 3) Eisenhower Road corridor; and 4) State Highway 7 corridor between Basehor and Lansing.
Future development within the designated urban growth areas should meet building design and code standards established by the corresponding city. Roads built in new residential neighborhoods should also meet city standards.

Create parks and open space as multi-use destinations. Designate flood plain areas as open space, trails, and recreational uses. The open space network would create a desirable recreational amenity and location for future residential housing.

County Road 1 maintains the only I-70 interchange in Leavenworth County. Future transportation plans should include constructing additional I-70 interchanges that will improve vehicular access and the ability to support future commercial and employment uses.

Direct east-west access from Leavenworth and Lansing to North Kansas City and I-435 is currently provided via Highways 5, 45, and 92. These routes are inefficient and lack capacity. A possible option to improve east-west access would be the extension of Highway 152 west from its current termination at I-435.

Additional north-south arterials are needed to promote improved vehicular access between the north and south areas of Leavenworth County.
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INTRODUCTION

As a sub-consultant, Canyon Research Southwest, Inc. has prepared an *Economic & Market Analysis and Market Positioning Strategy* for Leavenworth County, Kansas (“Planning Area”).

**Study Objective and Scope of Work**

Canyon Research Southwest, Inc. has prepared an *Economic and Market Analysis* and *Market Positioning Strategy* evaluating the historic, current, and future demographic, economic, and real estate market forces that influence the Leavenworth County’s future urban growth patterns. In doing so, the report consists of three sections, including: 1) Demographic and Economic Analysis; 2) Market Analysis; and 3) Market Positioning Strategy.

The *Demographic and Economic Analysis* section of the study assists in quantifying future demand for commercial, office and industrial space as well as residential housing units. Planning Area demographic characteristics and economic forces evaluated include population growth, household composition, age distribution, household income, educational attainment, and employment growth and composition.

The *Market Analysis* portion of the report evaluates directly competitive retail, employment, and residential market trends impacting the Planning Area. The market trends for each prospective land use were evaluated by quantifying such market forces as the current inventory of housing units and commercial space, construction activity, and development trends. The study also quantifies the Planning Area’s long-term need for additional retail, office, and industrial space as well as residential housing units to determine the ability to support future real estate development.

The *Market Positioning Strategy* identifies potential urban growth opportunities for Leavenworth County through 2040, including: 1) market opportunities and constraints; 2) long-term demand projections for retail, office, and industrial space as well as residential housing units; and 3) future land use patterns.

**Planning Area Defined**

Leavenworth County (“Planning Area”) is located within northeast quadrant of the State of Kansas and is considered a portion of the Kansas City metropolitan statistical area (“MSA”). The aerial on the following page depicts the Planning Area boundaries.

The Planning Area occupies approximately 470 square miles of land area and consists of the incorporated communities of Leavenworth, Basehor, Easton, Lansing, Linwood, and Tonganoxie. Leavenworth is the largest city with over 45 percent of the County population. The largest concentration of urban development is located within the Planning Area’s eastern boundary adjacent to Wyandotte County, Kansas.
ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

This section of the report examines the economic and demographic factors impacting real estate development trends in Leavenworth County and the four largest cities of Leavenworth, Lansing, Basehor, and Tonganoxie. It includes an analysis of population growth trends and projections, household composition, age distribution, household income, educational attainment, and employment trends. Historic demographic trends were provided by the American Community Survey published by the U.S. Census Bureau. Quantifying these economic and demographic characteristics will assist in forecasting the future demand for commercial space, industrial space, and residential housing units in Leavenworth County.

Population Growth Trends

Population growth has a direct impact on the demand for housing and retail space. Leavenworth County has benefitted from its location at the urban edge of the Kansas City MSA, adding over 28,000 residents since 1980. By 2019, the U.S. Census estimated the County population at 83,152 residents.

From 2019 to 2040, Leavenworth County population is forecast to increase by over 19,000 residents. Leavenworth County’s current population places limitations on the ability to support a diverse retail market, but continued population growth will generate increased demand for retail goods and services, commercial space, and new residential housing units. In the bar chart below U.S. Census Bureau population estimates are highlighted in “yellow” with future population projections highlighted in “blue”.

Leavenworth County Population Trends
Since the 1980’s the Leavenworth County population growth rate has outpaced both the State of Kansas and United States. Population growth in Leavenworth County was particularly strong during the decades of the 1980’s and 2000’s.

Leavenworth County consists of the incorporated communities of Leavenworth, Basehor, Easton, Lansing, Linwood, and Tonganoxie which in 2018 collectively totaled over 60,500 residents or three-quarters of the County population. Leavenworth is the largest city with over 44 percent of the County population.
The table below depicts population growth since 1980 for Leavenworth County’s largest cities. From 1980 to 2018, Leavenworth County’s four largest cities captured two-thirds of the total population growth, with the remaining one-third occurring within smaller cities and unincorporated areas of the County.

With a current population estimated at 36,062 residents, Leavenworth is the largest city in Leavenworth County, due in large part to a large military and federal presence. Since 1980, Leavenworth’s population has grown by just 2,406 residents, or 7.1 percent. Future population growth trends will be tied closely to fluctuations in local federal employment levels.

Lansing is the County’s second largest city with an estimated population of 11,964 residents. Since 1980, Lansing has experienced the largest absolute population growth with 6,857 new residents. Much of Lansing’s population growth was attributed to employment levels at Fort Leavenworth and the three area prisons as well as the in-migration of retired military personnel.

Basehor supports a population of approximately 6,194 residents. From 1980 to 2018, Basehor grew by 318 percent, adding 4,711 residents. Basehor is located in the southeast quadrant of Leavenworth County and is the most impacted by continued population and urban growth of the Kansas City MSA.

Despite being located the furthest from the Kansas City MSA’s urban fringe, from 1980 to 2018, Tonganoxie grew by nearly 200 percent, adding 3,660 residents.

### Population Growth Trends Leavenworth County Cities; 1980-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>54,809</td>
<td>33,656</td>
<td>38,495</td>
<td>35,420</td>
<td>35,251</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>5,107</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>9,199</td>
<td>11,265</td>
<td>11,964</td>
<td>6,857</td>
<td>134.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basehor</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>4,613</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>4,711</td>
<td>317.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonganoxie</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>5,524</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>196.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>42,110</td>
<td>49,553</td>
<td>49,585</td>
<td>56,125</td>
<td>59,744</td>
<td>17,634</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of County Total</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

From 2010 to 2018, the Leavenworth County population increased by 6.7 percent, adding 5,125 residents. Leavenworth was the slowest growing city in the County as the population increased by just 2.3 percent. Basehor reported the strongest population growth since 2010, adding 1,581 residents and increasing by 34.3 percent. Much of this recent population growth was attributed to Basehor’s proximity to Village West and continued urban expansion of the Kansas City MSA.
Household Composition

Household formation and the mix of household types have a direct impact on the composition of retail sales and housing demand. According to the American Community Survey published by the U.S. Census Bureau, during 2017 a reported 27,233 households resided in Leavenworth County with an average household size of 2.69 persons. Family households accounted for 72.0 percent of all households with 34.0 percent of households having children present. Married couple families accounted for 57.4 percent of all households, of which 24.5 percent had related children. The table below summarizes households by type for Leavenworth County in 2017.

Leavenworth County Households by Type – 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>State of Kansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>1,121,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under 18 Years</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under 18 Years</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily Households</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder Living Alone</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Years and Older</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Size</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

When compared to that of the State of Kansas, Leavenworth County’s household composition possesses well above average rates for both of families with children and married couples with children and a below average senior population ages 65 years and over.

Leavenworth County’s household composition characteristics would suggest a propensity for detached single-family housing and above average retail expenditures for household furnishings, groceries, clothing and accessories, sporting goods, books, and other family-related goods and services.

The table on the following page provides a comparison of household composition among the four largest cities in Leavenworth County.
Leavenworth County’s Four Largest Cities
Comparison of Households by Type – 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>City of Leavenworth</th>
<th>City of Lansing</th>
<th>City of Basehor</th>
<th>City of Tonganoxie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>12,472</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>1,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under 18 Years</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under 18 Years</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily Households</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder Living Alone</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Years and Older</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Size</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

In terms of household composition, none of the four largest cities mirror that of Leavenworth County as a whole. The City of Leavenworth’s household composition is impacted by the presence of Fort Leavenworth, supporting a well below average rate of family and married couple households and above average rates for nonfamily households and householders living alone.

Both Basehor and Lansing can be characterized as bedroom communities featuring above average rates of families with children and married couples with children. The average household size and average family size for both cities exceed that for Leavenworth County as a whole.

Tonganoxie, which is the most remote of the County’s four largest cities, possesses well below average rates of families with children and married couples with children and well above average rates for householders living alone and seniors ages 65 years and older.

Each city’s household composition will have a direct impact on the demand for and type of housing. While housing demand for each city will be led by single-family homes, the household composition for both Basehor and Lansing suggest larger homes to accommodate the presence of children. Tonganoxie’s large senior population may drive demand for smaller, maintenance-free housing. Leavenworth’s large single population will drive demand for rental housing with attached product a viable option.
**Population Age Distribution**

Age is an important factor in consumer identity, since consumption patterns, housing needs, and financial situation change significantly throughout an individual's lifetime. Change in the relative proportions of age groups throughout the United States is expected to have an important impact on the retailing and housing industries.

The bar chart below depicts Leavenworth County’s population by six primary age groups, including children (0-14 years), adolescent (15-24 years), young adults (25 to 34 years), family/working adults (35-44 years); empty nesters (45-64 years) and elderly (65+ years). Each of the six age groups possesses distinctively different consumption and housing needs.

According to the *American Community Survey 2017*, the average age of the Leavenworth County population of 40.2 years compares to the state average of 36.5 years. Children ages 0 to 14 comprise the County’s largest age group with 20.1 percent of the total population, followed by young adults ages 25 to 34 years at 18.4 percent, and family/working adults ages 35 to 44 years at 15.0 percent.

Children ages 0 to 14 years aren’t generally consumers per say, but their presence within a household generates retail expenditures on such items as apparel and accessories and groceries. This age group accounts for 20.1 percent of the Leavenworth County population.

The adolescent population ages 15 to 24 is key for supporting the sales of apparel and accessories, groceries, sporting goods, music, consumer electronics, eating and drinking places, and general merchandise. Adolescents account for 12.2 percent of the Leavenworth County population.

Young adults aged 25 to 34 years generally are new to the workforce. These tech savvy young adults are heavy consumers of electronics, apparel and accessories, entertainment, and rental housing. Young adults account for 18.4 percent of the Leavenworth County population and will have a growing impact on the local workforce, retail goods and services, and housing market.
The population ages 35 to 44 are in their child raising and principal consumer years, with expenditures favoring hardware, furniture and home furnishings, consumer electronics, department stores, and eating and drinking places. Family/working adults account for 15.0 percent of the Leavenworth County population.

Leavenworth County’s population ages 45 to 64 years account for 25.9 percent of the total population. People aged 45+ years are generally less consumers of apparel, consumer electronics, furniture, home furnishings, and entertainment than are younger consumers. This age group provides opportunities for home downsizing, restaurants, entertainment, and travel and will also produce a growing need for healthcare services and continuum care housing facilities.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, per capita retail expenditures by seniors 65+ years old is 18 percent lower than those under the age of 35 years and 41 percent lower than people ages 35 to 64 years. Residents 65+ years of age account for 13.2 percent of the Leavenworth County population. The growing senior population will generate increased demand for medical goods and services as well as downsized housing.

Among the six major age groups, those ages 35 to 64 possess the highest incomes and per capita consumer spending levels. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, people ages 35 to 64 possess an annual income 51 percent greater than those under the age of 35 years. Adults ages 35 to 54 years account for 28.2 percent of the Leavenworth County population and are in their peak spending years particularly for housing, home furnishings, home improvements, clothing, and entertainment.

The table below provides a comparison of population age distribution among the four largest cities in Leavenworth County. The high percentages of school age children and family/working adults (35-44 years) in each city suggest the demand for for-sale, single-family housing. High percentages of empty nesters (45-64 years) and seniors (65+ years) in Lansing and Tonganoxie suggest a growing need for smaller, maintenance-free housing.

**Leavenworth County’s Four Largest Cities**

**Comparison of Population Age Distribution – 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>City of Leavenworth</th>
<th>City of Lansing</th>
<th>City of Basehor</th>
<th>City of Tonganoxie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>79,359</td>
<td>35,958</td>
<td>11,771</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>5,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 14</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.
Household Income Distribution

Household income levels have a direct impact on retail sales volumes, housing demand, for-sale housing values, and residential rents. Leavenworth County’s median household income of $70,022 well exceeds that for Kansas of $55,477 with a much lower rate of households earning less than $35,000 and a much greater rate of high-income households earning $75,000 to $199,999. Leavenworth County’s household income levels would suggest the ability to support above average retail sales per capita, housing values, and residential rents. A comparison of household income distribution estimates for Leavenworth County and State of Kansas are outlined in the bar chart below.

Households with incomes of less than $25,000 account for 15.4 percent of all Leavenworth County households, suggesting a need for affordable and income-based housing. By comparison, 20.5 percent of Kansas households earn less than $25,000 annually.

Households with annual incomes of $75,000 to $99,999 account for 15.5 percent of all Leavenworth County households compared to 12.9 percent for Kansas. These households represent potential demand for for-sale housing, luxury apartments, and retail goods and services.

High-income households with annual incomes of $100,000 or more account for 29.8 percent of all Leavenworth County households compared to 22.8 percent for Kansas. These households represent potential demand for luxury housing and automobiles, retail goods and services, travel, and entertainment.

The table on the following page provides a comparison of household income distribution among the four largest cities in Leavenworth County.
Leavenworth County’s Four Largest Cities  
Comparison of Household Income Distribution – 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Range</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>City of Lansing</th>
<th>City of Basehor</th>
<th>City of Tonganoxie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>12,472</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>1,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 +</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$70,022</td>
<td>$58,989</td>
<td>$84,183</td>
<td>$77,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Household Income</td>
<td>$82,803</td>
<td>$69,979</td>
<td>$104,592</td>
<td>$96,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

Significant disparities in annual household income and distribution levels exist among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities.

Lansing supports the highest median household income and highest percentage of high-income households earning $100,000 and more, suggesting the financial capacity to support the highest for-sale housing values and residential rents. Lansing’s small percentage of households earning less than $35,000 suggests a modest need for income-based rental housing.

Basehor also supports an above average median household income and high-income households with the capability of supporting above average for-sale housing values and residential rents. Basehor also maintains an above average rate of households with income of $50,000 to $74,999 which should generate demand for first-time homebuyers. Basehor is forecast to support modest demand for income-based rental housing.

Tonganoxie’s household income distribution suggests strong demand for entry-level, for-sale housing and moderate demand for move-up housing. Tonganoxie’s high percentage of households earning less than $25,000 suggests a need for income-based rental housing.

Leavenworth supports the lowest median household income among the County’s four largest cities with demand for entry-level, for-sale housing and move-up housing. Leavenworth’s well above average rate of households earning less than $25,000 suggests a strong need for income-based rental housing.
Educational Attainment

Educational attainment levels of a market area’s labor pool are becoming increasingly important in the ability to attract and retain knowledge-based industries as well as the ability to support above average wages. The bar chart below provides a comparison of educational attainment levels between Leavenworth County and State of Kansas as provided by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Educational Attainment Levels

Educational levels have a direct impact on achievable income levels, retail expenditure patterns, housing values, and the demand for commercial space. The demand for retail space increases as income and retail sales levels rise. The type of retail space is also impacted as high-income households support increased demand for higher valued goods and services. The demand for office space improves at higher educational attainment levels as a larger percentage of residents are more likely to be employed in professional service and medical professions.

The Leavenworth County population is well educated with 30.9 percent of the population attaining a graduate/professional or bachelor’s degree compared to 32.3 percent statewide. Conversely, 36.9 percent of Leavenworth County residents attained a high school diploma or less compared to 35.7 percent of the statewide population.

Leavenworth County’s educational attainment levels translate into the potential to support above average wages and spending on such retail categories as personal services, apparel, household furnishings, entertainment, dining out, automobiles, and healthcare. The educational attainment levels may also improve Leavenworth County’s ability to meet the employment needs of the changing technology-based economy as well as increase the demand for professional office space.

The table on the following pages provides a comparison of educational attainment levels among the four largest cities in Leavenworth County.
Leavenworth County’s Four Largest Cities
Comparison of Educational Attainment Levels – 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>City of Leavenworth</th>
<th>City of Lansing</th>
<th>City of Basehor</th>
<th>City of Tonganoxie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 Years and Over</td>
<td>53,657</td>
<td>23,383</td>
<td>8,146</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>3,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th Grade</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th Grade, No Diploma</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate or GED</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional Degree</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

The residents of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities possess high educational attainment levels, but some disparities are evident.

Basehor supports the highest educational attainment levels with 43.2 percent of its residents ages 25 years and older possessing a bachelor’s degree or better. A reported 19.0 percent of Basehor residents possess a graduate or professional degree, the highest rate among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. These high educational attainment levels are consistent with Basehor’s above average income levels and status as a bedroom community with the capability of supporting above average for-sale housing values and residential rents.

Tonganoxie supports the second highest level of educational attainment among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities with 32.2 percent of residents ages 25 years and older attaining a bachelor’s degree or better.

A reported 31.0 percent of Leavenworth residents possess a bachelor’s degree or better and the second highest rate of residents with a graduate or professional degree. Leavenworth’s educational attainment distribution rates close mirror that of Leavenworth County as a whole. Leavenworth’s educational attainment levels are influenced by the presence of Fort Leavenworth.

Educational attainment for Lansing is slightly below the countywide average with 30.5 percent of residents 25 years of age and older possessing a bachelor’s degree or better. Despite the moderate education levels Lansing supports the highest income levels which may be influenced by a large population of military retirees.
Major Employers

The table below identifies the largest employers operating in Leavenworth County as provided by the Leavenworth County Development Corporation. Government is the dominant employer in Leavenworth County taking the form of military, healthcare, corrections, and education. Fort Leavenworth is the County’s largest employer with 8,821 military and civilian staff, followed by the VA Medical Center with 685 employees, the Lansing Correctional Facility and several local school districts. Walmart, Northrup-Grumman, and Hallmark are the largest private sector employers.

Of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities, Leavenworth serves as the principal employment center supporting the bulk of major employers and jobs. Principal employers in Leavenworth include Fort Leavenworth and VA Medical Center. Private-sector employers in Leavenworth include Walmart, Northrup-Grumman, and Hallmark Cards.

Government is the largest employer for Lansing, Basehor and Tonganoxie. These bedroom communities lack large private-sector employers.

Leavenworth County Major Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th># of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Leavenworth</td>
<td>Army-Military/Civilians</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>8,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Medical Center</td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth USD #453</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing Correctional Facility</td>
<td>State Corrections</td>
<td>Lansing, Kansas</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing USD #469</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Lansing, Kansas</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Administration - CPAC</td>
<td>Patient Account Center</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Federal Penitentiary</td>
<td>Federal Corrections</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart Supercenter</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northrup-Grumman</td>
<td>Defense Contractor</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basehor USD #458</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Basehor, Kansas</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Leavenworth Schools USD #207</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonganoxie USD #464</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Tonganoxie, Kansas</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark Cards, Inc.</td>
<td>Gift Wrap &amp; Party Essentials</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leavenworth</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leavenworth County Development Corporation.
The federal government has a significant impact on the Leavenworth County economy, operating Fort Leavenworth, Veterans Affairs, 35th Infantry Division, Mission Training Center, and U.S. Penitentiary. In August 2014 the Mid-America Regional Council published a report that estimated the economic impact of these federal facilities on Leavenworth County and the greater Kansas City MSA.

Fort Leavenworth has a significant economic impact on the Kansas City MSA. For 2013, the Mid-America Regional Council estimated that Fort Leavenworth had a $2.34 billion economic impact on the region. Incorporating Veterans Affairs, U.S. Penitentiary, 35th Infantry Division, and Mission Training Complex brings the total economic impact for 2013 of nearly $3.1 billion.

**Total Economic Impact on Kansas City Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Facility</th>
<th>Economic Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Leavenworth</td>
<td>$2,341,728,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth Medical Center</td>
<td>$316,022,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAC Leavenworth</td>
<td>$68,599,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMOP Leavenworth</td>
<td>$138,510,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Penitentiary</td>
<td>$125,362,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th Infantry Division</td>
<td>$34,495,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Training Complex</td>
<td>$62,794,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Economic Impact</td>
<td>$3,087,512,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Mid America Regional Council.*
Employment Trends

Since gains in employment generally fuels growth in population, income, and retail expenditures, job growth is a reliable indicator of general economic conditions and demand for housing and commercial and industrial space. Typically, households prefer to live near work for convenience. Affordable housing costs, reduced commute times, and higher quality of life can also motivate employees to relocate from elsewhere in a metropolitan area to the community where their job exists.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, after peaking in 2007 at 31,086 jobs and an unemployment rate of 5.4 percent, employment in Leavenworth County hit a low in 2009 of 30,100 jobs and an 8.0 percent unemployment rate. The job market has since steadily improved reaching 35,2016 jobs by 2018 and a healthy unemployment rate of 3.6 percent. Annualized employment levels for Leavenworth County from 2008 through 2018 are depicted in the bar chart below.

From 2008 to 2018 Leavenworth County added nearly 4,130 new jobs, an increase of 13.3 percent. Leavenworth County is forecast to add approximately 8,500 jobs through 2040.

Employment growth rate comparisons from 2008 through 2018 for Leavenworth County and the State of Kansas are depicted in the bar chart on the following page. Since 2010, annual job growth rate patterns for Leavenworth County have trended higher than the statewide average. Job growth for Leavenworth County has been strongest since 2014 reporting annual growth rates of 1.21 percent to 2.23 percent. By comparison, since 2014 annual employment growth in Kansas ranged from a -0.7 percent to 1.03 percent.
Leading employment sectors in Leavenworth County include:

1. Healthcare and Education
2. Public Administration
3. Retail Trade
4. Entertainment, Accommodations & Food Service
5. FIRE and Information

Compared to statewide averages, Leavenworth County supports a higher rate of construction and public administration employment. Employment sectors where Leavenworth County lags include manufacturing, professional and business services, and retail trade.
Tourism Market Trends

Tourism is having a growing impact on the Leavenworth County economy. According to the *Economic Impact of Travel in Kansas*, tourism expenditures in Leavenworth County increased 36.7 percent from 2013 to 2017, reaching $58.61 million.

During 2017, tourism expenditures in Leavenworth County were led by transportation at $19.66 million, followed by food & beverage at $17.02 million and retail at $7.77 million.

Tourism related employment in Leavenworth County increased from 720 jobs in 2013 to 884 jobs in 2017.
Economic Development Factors

Based on interviews with City and County staff as well as economic development professionals, the bullet points below summarize the strengths and weaknesses in fostering economic development in Leavenworth County.

**Strengths/Assets**

- Leavenworth County benefits from a regional economy centered on the Kansas City MSA. The region supports a diverse economy and is experiencing steady employment and population growth. Leavenworth County is located at the periphery of the Kansas City MSA and benefits from being within the path of urban growth;

- Leavenworth County benefits from access an extensive highway system, proximity to Kansas City International Airport, and federal economic drivers (i.e., Fort Leavenworth, Veterans Administration, and Federal Penitentiary). Fort Leavenworth is the intellectual center for the United States Army;

- Leavenworth County benefits from such post-secondary schools as University of St. Mary, University of Kansas, KCKCC (Pioneer Center), and educational consortium;

- Four business parks offering shovel-ready sites operate in Leavenworth County, highlighted by the new 135-acre Tonganoxie Business Park and 82-acre Leavenworth Business & Tech Park. Compared to more urbanized areas of the Kansas City MSA, Leavenworth County benefits from very competitive land prices;

- Leavenworth County’s population is well educated with a large percentage of residents attaining a bachelor’s degree or better;

- Leavenworth County maintains a high quality of life;

- Affordable for-sale housing costs within each of the County’s four major cities targeting differing housing products and price points;

- Housing opportunities range from small town living in several communities of various sizes to country living in unincorporated portions of the county;

- Leavenworth County is improving County Road 1 from the Interstate 70 interchange north to the Tonganoxie Business Park;

- Labor force basin supports approximately 380,000 jobs;

- Leavenworth County’s tourism and lodging industries are having a growing economic impact; and

- Kansas is a right to work state with economic incentives available to qualified businesses
Weakness/Liabilities

- No available manufacturing buildings of 40,000 to 400,000 square feet and limited inventory of office space available for immediate occupancy;
- No shovel-ready parcels of more than 40 acres in size and no parcels within the four active business parks offering rail service;
- Only one I-70 interchange presently in Leavenworth County;
- Proximity to Village West and Zona Rosa places a major constraint in attracting major retail development to Leavenworth County;
- Limited technical training resources;
- Leavenworth County’s low unemployment rate places constraints on the availability of labor;
- In attracting business Leavenworth County suffers from limited funding levels and resources and faces stiff competition from other cities within the Kansas City MSA and beyond;
- Leavenworth County suffers from parochialism in the form of north versus south, urban versus rural, and city versus city;
- Leavenworth County lacks a diversified employment base that is heavily reliant on federal, state, and local government;
- The City of Leavenworth is landlocked in three directions, is serviced by only one major highway, and the older parts of the city possess an aging infrastructure;
- While housing costs are low there is a limited inventory of active new home subdivisions;
- The County tax base is hampered by the federal and state government’s large landholdings that are tax exempt; and
- Single-family homes account for the bulk of the County’s housing stock with a limited inventory of market-rate apartment communities.

Leavenworth County possesses ample advantages for attracting businesses, jobs, and development activity. The principal economic development benefit lies within being located at the periphery of a growing regional economy whose assets include a large population; diverse economy, convenient highway, air and rail access; well educated population; and high quality of life. Economic development benefits offered by Leavenworth County include a rural lifestyle, four shovel-ready business parks with low land costs, affordable housing costs, and a well-educated population. Challenges facing future economic development efforts in Leavenworth County include a low unemployment rate that places constraints on the available labor force, lack of rail served business parks, limited inventory of industrial and office space available for immediate occupancy, and stiff competition from other cities within the Kansas City MSA.
Conclusions

Leavenworth County’s urban growth is influenced by its location at the urban fringe of the Kansas City MSA. As the Kansas City region continues to grow Leavenworth County is anticipated to experienced accelerated population and job growth, residential and commercial development activity, and increased demands for municipal and transportation services.

By 2040, Leavenworth County is forecast to add approximately 19,000 residents and 8,500 jobs, generating demand for new housing, retail goods and services, eating and drinking establishments, and commercial and industrial space.

Household income levels in Leavenworth County suggest a future need for a wide variety of housing products, including affordable, entry level, and move up housing.

Leavenworth County’s high educational attainment levels bode well for attracting employers and supporting above average income levels, retail expenditures, and housing values and rents.

Leavenworth County’s large Millennial population creates demand for rental housing, clothing, electronics, entertainment, and eating and drinking establishments.

Forecast continued job creation in Leavenworth County will yield a growing demand for professional office, medical office, retail, and industrial space.

Continued growth in tourism expenditures in Leavenworth County will have a positive impact on revenues within the lodging, retail, entertainment, and eating and drinking sectors of the economy.

Leavenworth County possesses ample advantages for attracting businesses, jobs, and development activity. The principal economic development benefit lies within being located at the periphery of a growing regional economy whose assets include a large population; diverse economy, convenient highway, air and rail access; well educated population; and high quality of life. Economic development benefits offered by Leavenworth County include a rural lifestyle, four shovel-ready business parks with low land costs, affordable housing costs, and a well-educated population. Challenges facing future economic development efforts in Leavenworth County include a low unemployment rate that places constraints on the available labor force, lack of rail served business parks, limited inventory of industrial and office space available for immediate occupancy, and stiff competition from other cities within the Kansas City MSA.

Leavenworth County’s four largest cities each maintain distinctive demographic and economic characteristics which should assist in promoting future employment and population growth.

Basehor is bedroom community situated in closest proximity to the path of the Kansas City MSA urban expansion and has experienced the strongest population growth since 2010. Basehor’s population is well educated, possesses above average income levels, and consists largely of young families. Basehor is anticipated to continue to attract families with above average income levels. Basehor supports very little commerce and employment.
Lansing is a well-educated community supporting the highest income and family household levels among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. Lansing has also supported the largest population growth in the county since 1980. Lansing supports very little commerce and modest employment levels.

Tonganoxie is within the southwest quadrant of the County and is the County’s fourth largest city with a population of just over 5,500 residents. Despite being located the furthest from the Kansas City MSA’s urban fringe, from 2010 to 2018, Tonganoxie grew by nearly 200 percent, adding 3,660 residents. Of the County’s four largest cities, Tonganoxie supports the lowest rates for family households and households with children, the highest rate of residents age 65 years or more, and the second highest level of educational attainment.

Leavenworth serves as Leavenworth County’s principal commerce and employment center driven by the presence of Fort Leavenworth, VA Medical Center, and Veterans Administration. Despite the large government presence, since 1980 Leavenworth has been the slowest growing community in Leavenworth County. Leavenworth supports a below average rate of family households and above average for people living alone. Educational attainment for Leavenworth mirrors the county average, but the income levels are the lowest among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities.
MARKET ANALYSIS

The Market Analysis portion of the study evaluated directly competitive retail, professional office, industrial, and housing market trends impacting Leavenworth County. The market trends for each prospective land use were evaluated and the long-term need for additional commercial space, industrial space, and housing units was forecast to quantify the level of future real estate development in Leavenworth County.

Retail Market Analysis

The Retail Market Analysis portion of the report evaluates directly competitive retail market trends impacting Leavenworth County and forecasts future demand for commercial space.

Competitive Retail Market Overview

According to the Leavenworth County Retail Submarket Report published by CoStar, by the second quarter 2019 the inventory of retail space in Leavenworth County totaled 2.6 million square feet, or just 2 percent of the Kansas City MSA total. General retail and neighborhood shopping center space accounted for the bulk of the total inventory with 2.1 million square feet and 303,000 square feet, respectively. Leavenworth serves as the County’s principal retail destination.

Despite the large inventory of retail space, Leavenworth County supports just 31 square feet of occupied retail space per capita compared to 56 square feet per capita for the Kansas City MSA. This well below average supportable retail space may be attributed to Leavenworth County’s modest population and convenient access to large retail destinations in the Kansas City MSA.

From a high of 6.7 percent in 2017, the County’s retail vacancy rate has improved to a healthy 1.8 percent in response to escalating space absorption. During the first half of 2019 net absorption totaled 96,287 square feet.

![Leavenworth County Retail Market Trends in Net Space Absorption and Vacancies](chart.jpg)
Over the past five years the average rental rate for retail space in Leavenworth County increased by 10.7 percent to $10.78 per square foot. By comparison, over the same timeframe the average retail rent for the Kansas City MSA increased by 12.3 percent to $15.65 per square foot.

### Leavenworth County Retail Market Conditions; 2019 Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Building Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Asking Rent</th>
<th>Absorption YTD</th>
<th>Space U/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>303,097</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>$10.63</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Center</td>
<td>144,654</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>$11.98</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Retail</td>
<td>2,114,955</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$10.72</td>
<td>92,244</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,562,706</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar.

From 2007 through 2018, despite a growing population, Costar reported just 169,536 square feet of retail space was constructed in Leavenworth County. Retail construction peaked in 2009 with the completion of 102,550 square feet of space. No new retail space was constructed from 2010 through 2014. New retail construction has shown a slight upturn since 2015.

Leavenworth serves as Leavenworth County’s principal retail destination. Leavenworth’s retail market is anchored by its 28-block downtown area that is home to a host of specialty shops, entertainment, and restaurants. Highway 7 is Leavenworth’s principal commercial corridor, with Eisenhower Road serving as a secondary corridor. Major retailers operating stores in Leavenworth...
include Walmart, Acre Hardware, Home Depot, Aldi, Dillon’s, Price Chopper, CVS, Walgreens, Hibbett Sports, Dollar General, Aaron’s, and Genesis Health Club.

Basehor, Lansing, and Tonganoxie all support modest retail markets. None of these communities have yet to reach population thresholds required to attract significant retail development. In addition, proximity to Village West’s large inventory of big-box retailers, specialty shops, and restaurants has proven to be a deterrent in attracting major retail chains.

Basehor is a bedroom community of approximately 6,200 residents. Existing retail development in Basehor is confined to the intersection of 155th Street and State Avenue that includes several strip centers and freestanding businesses such as Orscheln Farm & Home, Sonic, and Citizens Savings. The 31-acre Wolf Creek project at the northeast corner of 155th Street and State Avenue is anchored by Orscheln and offers fully developed pad sites for retail use.

Lansing is a town of approximately 12,000 residents located immediately south of Leavenworth. Highway 7 serves as Lansing’s principal retail corridor. Commercial uses along Highway 7 include strip centers, restaurants, bank branches, and freestanding businesses such as Dollar General and Tractor Supply. Lansing Towne Center is a mixed-use project located at Highway 7 and Mary Street west of City Hall. The property is situated within a Tax Increment Financing (“TIF”) District and a Transportation Development District (“TDD”) that provide economic incentives for future development. The City has installed infrastructure to the 46-acre parcel but vertical development has yet to occur.

Tonganoxie is a town of approximately 5,500 residents located six miles west of Basehor and 13 miles northeast of Lawrence. Tonganoxie’s retail base is limited to the downtown area and a small number of retailers along U.S. Highway 24, including Brothers Market, Ace Hardware, and Dollar General.

**Trade Area Capture**

Information about a community’s retail trade area can help assess the ability of local merchants to attract and capture the retail business of local residents. The trade area capture (“TAC”) is an estimate of the number of people who shop in the local area during a certain period. TAC assumes that local residents will buy goods at the same rate as the state average, and that the only force that causes a variation in spending patterns is income. The formula for calculating TAC is:

\[
TAC = \frac{\text{Community’s Actual Retail Sales}}{\text{State Per Capita Sales}} \times \frac{\text{Community’s Per Capita Income}}{\text{State Per Capita Income}}
\]

If the TAC estimate is larger than the community’s population it suggests: 1) the community is attracting customers outside its boundaries or 2) residents of the community are spending more than the state average. If the estimate is smaller than the community’s population: 1) the community is losing its customers to other regions for retail purchases or 2) residents of the community are spending less than the state average.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Leavenworth County’s 2018 population was estimated at 81,352 residents and per capita income of $30,170. The Kansas Department of Revenue reported 2018 FY retail sales for Leavenworth County of $663 million.
The U.S. Census estimated the 2018 population for Kansas at 2,911,505 residents and per capita income of $29,600. Based on data from the Kansas Department of Revenue the state’s per capita retail sales is estimated at $14,981.

\[
\text{Trade Area Capture} = \frac{\$663,147,250}{\$14,981 \times \left( \frac{\$30,170}{\$29,600} \right)} = 43,430 \text{ Residents}
\]

The Leavenworth County’s resident population of 81,352 and estimated TAC of 43,430 residents illustrates the County’s well below average capture of retail sales.

**Retail Pull Factor**

Pull factors (“PF”) measure a community’s ability to attract shoppers, residents and non-residents alike, to make retail purchases within the community. A pull factor is a measure of the strength of a community’s retail trade, based on a comparison of local spending in relation to that of a wider geographic area (e.g. the state), with a measure of 1.0 representing a perfect balance. A pull factor greater than 1.0 indicates that the community is pulling in retail sales from beyond its boundaries and the balance of trade is favorable. Alternatively, a pull factor less than 1.0 indicates that the community is not capturing local shoppers and is experiencing retail sales leakage. Pull factors are calculated by dividing the TAC by the community’s population.

Dividing the trade area capture of 43,430 residents by Leavenworth County’s population of 81,352 yields a pull factor of 0.534, indicating that the County’s retail sales capture represents just over 53 percent of the statewide average. The County is therefore suffering from significant retail sales leakage into the balance of the Kansas City MSA.

The Kansas Department of Revenue publishes an annual *County Trade Pull Factor Report* that calculates the retail pull factor for all counties in the state measured against the statewide average. Despite supporting a median household income that exceeds the Kansas MSA rate, according to the report, Leavenworth County suffers from considerable retail sales leakage. Since 2010, the annual pull factor has remained largely unchanged and the current rate of 0.59 indicates that Leavenworth County captures retail sales at a rate equal to just 59 percent of the statewide average.
The City of Leavenworth, which is the County’s principal retail destination, supports a slightly higher pull factor of 0.86 but captures retail sales at a rate well below the statewide average.

Leavenworth County’s long-standing retail sales leakage is a symptom of modest population levels, presence at the urban fringe, and proximity to larger and more diverse retail destinations in the Kansas City MSA.

**Retail Space Demand Estimates**

As of the second quarter 2019 Leavenworth County’s 2.6 million square feet of retail space was operating at a below market equilibrium vacancy rate of 1.8 percent, indicating a market capable of supporting additional inventory of space. This section of the study provides conservative and optimistic retail space demand estimates from 2019 to 2040 for Leavenworth County.

Supportable retail sales are a function of consumer population and income levels. A trade area’s total income is calculated by multiplying the total trade area population by the per capita personal income. Purchasing power, or total sales potential of the trade area, is then quantified by applying average retail expenditures as a percentage of total income.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimated the 2018 population for Leavenworth County at 81,352 residents with a per capita income of $30,170, yielding total personal income of approximately $2.45 billion. Based on the *U.S. Census Bureau Annual Retail Trade Survey* and Leavenworth County’s per capita income and retail sales levels, retail goods and services sales equate to a spending rate equivalent to approximately 40 percent of total personal income. The County’s current retail pull factor is 0.59.

By 2040, the County’s population is forecast to increase by 19,183 new residents. For this analysis per capita income and average retail sales per square foot remained constant. The variable will be Leavenworth County’s achievable retail pull factor.

Under the conservative scenario the County’s pull factor remains at 0.59 throughout the projection period. By 2040, Leavenworth County is forecast to capture new retail goods and services sales of $137 million, supporting approximately 594,000 square feet of new retail space.

The optimistic scenario assumes the County’s population growth will lead to accelerated retail development and an improved retail pull factor, estimated at 0.67 through 2040. By 2040, Leavenworth County is forecast to capture new retail goods and services sales of $155 million and approximately 674,000 square feet of new retail space.

Retail space demand projections for Leavenworth County through 2040 are depicted in the table on the following page.
Retail Space Demand Projections; 2019 - 2040
Leavenworth County, Kansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Sales Formula</th>
<th>Conservative Scenario</th>
<th>Optimistic Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Population Growth</td>
<td>19,188</td>
<td>19,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$30,170</td>
<td>$30,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Personal Income</td>
<td>$578,901,960</td>
<td>$578,901,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Income Spent on Retail Goods and Services</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportable Goods and Services by County Residents</td>
<td>$231,560,784</td>
<td>$231,560,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County Pull Factor</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supportable Retail Goods &amp; Services Sales</td>
<td>$136,620,863</td>
<td>$155,145,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Retail Sales Per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportable Retail Space (Sq. Ft.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>594,004</strong></td>
<td><strong>674,547</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canyon Research Southwest, Inc.; September 2019.

**Conclusions**

The Leavenworth County retail inventory totals 2.6 million square feet with the City of Leavenworth serving as the principal center for retail goods and services. The communities of Basehor, Lansing, and Tonganoxie support modest retail markets given their small populations and proximity to Village West which supports a large inventory of big-box retailers, specialty shops, and restaurants.

The County’s current inventory of occupied retail space equates to just 31 square feet per capita compared to 56 square feet per capita for the Kansas City MSA. From a high of 6.7 percent in 2017, the County’s retail vacancy rate has reached a healthy 1.8 percent, limiting the ability to accommodate new retailers into the market without the construction of additional space.

Since 2010, Leavenworth County has suffered from considerable retail sales leakage supporting an annual pull factor ranging from 0.54 to 0.59. Leavenworth County’s high rate of retail sales leakage is a symptom of modest population levels, presence at the urban fringe, and proximity to larger and more diverse retail destinations in the Kansas City MSA.

From 2019 to 2040 population growth in Leavenworth County is forecast to generate the demand for approximately 594,000 to 674,000 square feet of occupied retail space.
Employment Market Analysis

This section of the study evaluates directly competitive employment-related market conditions impacting Leavenworth County by identifying the Leavenworth County office and industrial market trends and forecasting long-term office and industrial space demand. The goal is to identify future opportunities for Leavenworth County to support employment-related development.

Employment-Related Business Mix

For this analysis industrial-related employment is defined as the manufacturing and wholesale trade & transportation sectors while office-related employment includes the FIRE and information, professional services and business services sectors. In the bar chart below industrial-related sectors are highlighted in “blue” with office-related sectors highlighted in “yellow”.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, office-related employment in Leavenworth County consists of 2,807 jobs in the FIRE and information sectors and 2,659 jobs in the professional and business services sectors. Collectively, these 5,466 jobs account for 16.0 percent of Leavenworth County’s total employment. By comparison, office-related jobs account for 18.1 percent of employment in Kansas. At an average space requirement of 200 to 225 square feet per employee, current employment levels can support approximately 1.1 million to 1.2 million square feet of occupied professional office space.

Industrial-related employment in Leavenworth County totals 4,935 jobs in the manufacturing and wholesale trade sectors, or 14.5 percent of Leavenworth County’s total employment. By comparison, industrial-related jobs account for 20.9 percent of employment in Kansas. At an average space requirement of 1,000 to 1,250 square feet per employee, current employment levels can support approximately 4.9 million to 6.2 million square feet of occupied industrial space.
Leavenworth County Office Market Overview

According to the Office Market Report published by CoStar, by the second quarter 2019 the inventory of office space in Leavenworth County totaled 957,911 square feet, or just 0.78 percent of the Kansas City MSA inventory. Leavenworth supports the bulk of office space in Leavenworth County. Class A space totals just 109,911 square feet of space operating at an average rent of $24.04/SF and 0.0 percent vacancy rate. Class B office properties total 468,250 square feet of leasable space operating at an overall vacancy rate of 15.8 percent and an average rental rate of $17.45 per square foot.

Leavenworth County Office Market Conditions; 2019 Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>Building Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>Absorption YTD 2019</th>
<th>Space U/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>109,644</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$24.04</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>468,250</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>$17.45</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>380,017</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>$15.31</td>
<td>-1,410</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>957,911</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>$17.36</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Costar.

Since 2015, Leavenworth County has absorbed 116,175 square feet of net office space with no new construction reported. As a result of these market dynamics the overall vacancy rate has gradually improved from 15.1 percent in 2015 to 9.7 percent by 2019 Q2. The lack of available office space has hampered the ability of Leavenworth County to attract office tenants. By comparison, the Kansas City MSA office market is currently operating at a vacancy rate of just 6.6 percent. No new office space is currently under construction within Leavenworth County. Vacancies are forecast to remain stable over the next several years.
During the national recession the average rent for the Leavenworth County office market declined in 2009, 2010, and 2012. Since that time the absence of new construction and improving vacancy trends have produced a steady upward trend in rents, increasing from an average of $14.59 per square foot in 2010 to $17.27 per square foot by 2018. Rent escalations peaked from 2014 to 2017 with annual growth range from a healthy 2.8 percent to 5.2 percent.

![Leavenworth County Trends in Annual Office Space Rent Escalations](image)

Despite the upward trend in rents since 2013 they are not high enough to support construction of speculative space with new development driven by owner-user demand. There is currently no speculative office space under construction or planned for near-term development in Leavenworth County.

**Leavenworth County Industrial Market Overview**

According to the *Industrial Market Report* published by CoStar, by the second quarter 2019 the Leavenworth County industrial market supported 4.22 million square feet of space consisting of 3.6 million square feet of warehouse space, 25,280 square feet of flex space and 554,194 square feet of specialized industrial space.

**Leavenworth County Industrial Market Conditions; 2019 Q2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>Building Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Average Rent</th>
<th>Absorption YTD 2019</th>
<th>Space U/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>3,644,583</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$4.66</td>
<td>-5,400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Industrial</td>
<td>554,194</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$5.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex</td>
<td>25,280</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$5.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4,224,057</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$4.72</td>
<td>-5,400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Costar,
Since 2015 Leavenworth County has absorbed 551,246 square feet of industrial space with new supply limited to just 81,000 square feet. Given these supply and demand trends, the County’s overall vacancy rate has dropped from 12.0 percent at year-end 2014 to just 0.6 percent by mid-2019. Since 2016, the Leavenworth County industrial market has operated at a vacancy rate of 0.8 percent or less. The lack of available industrial space inventory places a significant constraint on the ability of Leavenworth County to attract industrial-based businesses.

![Graph](image)

Since 2015, the average rental rate for industrial space in Leavenworth County increased by 6.6 percent to $4.72/SF. By comparison, over the same timeframe the average industrial rent for the Kansas City MSA increased by 6.9 per to $5.29/SF.

With low vacancies and increasing rents near-term development opportunities exist in Leavenworth County for flex office/industrial and warehouse space. According to Costar, as of the second quarter 2019 no industrial space was under construction or proposed for development in Leavenworth County.

The Leavenworth County Development Corporation (“LCDC”) is responsible for promoting the economic growth of the Leavenworth County communities of Leavenworth, Lansing, Basehor, and Tonganoxie. The organization assists startup companies and those expanding or relocating with site selection, economic incentives, and the municipal approval and permitting process. Industries the LCDC is targeting for future growth in Leavenworth County include:

- Bio-science
- Animal health
- Cyber security
- Advanced and light manufacturing
- Warehouse and distribution
- Food processing

To assist in economic development efforts the LCDC is marketing four industrial and business parks in Leavenworth County, including two in Leavenworth and two in Tonganoxie. Available incentives include competitive land costs, property tax abatement, and State programs.

*Canyon Research Southwest, Inc.*
West Eisenhower Road in Leavenworth is a major employment corridor housing two business parks along with facilities for Hallmark Cards and Armed Forces Insurance. No industrial parks are actively developing in either Basehor or Lansing.

The Gary Carlson Business Center is located at 13th Street and Eisenhower Road in Leavenworth. Existing tenants operating in the park include Cereal Ingredients (200+ employees), CMOP, and Fastenal. Three lots totaling approximately 25 acres remaining available for future development.

The 81-acre Leavenworth Business and Technology Park is located at 14th Street and Eisenhower Road in Leavenworth. A spine road has been constructed through the property featuring two lanes of traffic, curb, gutter, sidewalks, streetlights, and utilities. Shovel-ready sites are available for development ranging in size from two to 50 acres.

The Urban Hess Business Center is located at County Road 5 and Laming Road in Tonganoxie. No new development has occurred within the business park for over a decade. Ten shovel-ready sites ranging in size from 1.5 to 4.5 acres remain available for future development. In total, approximately 25 acres of land remains undeveloped within the Urban Hess Business Center.

The newly developed Tonganoxie Business Park is located at County Road 1 and Kansas Avenue at the southern portion of Tonganoxie. The property is owned by the City of Tonganoxie and totals 237 acres with 135 acres graded and infrastructure constructed. The Tonganoxie Business Park is located three miles north of Interstate 70 with direct access provided via County Road 1 which the County is currently improving. Two to 38-acre shovel-ready sites are available. Unilock has purchased 34 acres and has constructed a 7,000 square foot building on 16 acres.

**Forecast Space Demand**

Professional office and industrial space demand projections for Leavenworth County through the year 2040 provide an understanding of future market conditions directly impacting the feasibility of new employment-related development supportable within Leavenworth County.

**Professional Office Space**

The demand for professional office space is closely correlated with expansion in office space using employment sectors. Future demand for professional office space was forecast utilizing an occupational employment-driven model. This model was designed using the variables of increased employment in categories of economic activity typically associated with demand for office space and average space requirements per employee. A share of regional demand is assigned to the submarket (and specific project) on the basis of location, competition, access, project scale, etc.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, office-related employment in Leavenworth County totals 5,466 jobs in the FIRE, information, and professional and business services sectors. Collectively, these sectors account for 16.0 percent of Leavenworth County’s total employment.

From 2019 through 2040, job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to increase at an average annual rate of approximately 1.1 percent, yielding an estimated 8,528 new jobs. Office-related employment is forecast to account for 18 percent of total job growth, or 1,535 new jobs.

Canyon Research Southwest, Inc.
Office space demand created by the future growth in office-related employment was forecast by applying standard job creation ratios published by NAIOP of 1.0 job per 200 to 225 square feet of office space that accounts for both owner-occupied and speculative office space. From 2019 through 2040, office-related job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to support the need for approximately 307,000 to 345,000 square feet of owner-occupied and speculative office space.

**Forecast Professional Office Space Demand**  
**Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2019 to 2040**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moderate Scenario</th>
<th>Optimistic Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leavenworth County, KS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office-Related Employment Growth</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Office Space Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>307,000</td>
<td>345,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Office Space Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>13,955</td>
<td>15,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industrial Space**

The demand for industrial space is a function of employment, investment, and technology. The U.S. Department of Labor defines industrial employment as jobs in the manufacturing, wholesale trade, and transportation and warehousing industries.

Industrial-related employment in Leavenworth County totals 4,935 jobs in the manufacturing and wholesale trade, and transportation sectors, or 14.5 percent of total employment.

Through 2040, Leavenworth County is forecast to add 8,528 jobs. Industrial-related employment is forecast to account for 21 percent of total job growth, adding an estimated 1,790 new jobs.

Space needs created by the future growth in industrial-related employment was forecast by applying standard job creation ratios of 1.0 job per 1,000 to 1,250 square feet of light manufacturing, warehouse and flex industrial space. This job creation rates account for both owner-occupied and speculative industrial space.

**Industrial Space Demand Forecasts**  
**Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2019 to 2040**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moderate Scenario</th>
<th>Optimistic Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leavenworth County, KS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial-Based Employment Growth</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Space Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
<td>2,237,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Industrial Space Demand (Sq. Ft.)</td>
<td>81,364</td>
<td>101,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 2019 through 2040, industrial-related job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to support the need for approximately 1.8 million to 2.2 million square feet of both owner-occupied and speculative industrial space.

**Conclusions**

The existing inventory of office space in Leavenworth County totals 957,911 square feet. Since 2015, Leavenworth County has absorbed 116,175 square feet of net office space with no new construction reported. As a result, the overall vacancy rate has gradually improved from 15.1 percent in 2015 to 9.7 percent by mid-2019.

Despite the upward trend in office rents since 2013 they yet to reach the level to support construction of speculative space with new development driven by end-user demand. There is currently no speculative office space under construction or planned for near-term development in Leavenworth County.

From 2019 through 2040, office-related job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to support the need for approximately 307,000 to 345,000 square feet of both owner-occupied and speculative office space.

By the second quarter 2019 the Leavenworth County industrial market supported 4.22 million square feet of space consisting of 3.6 million square feet of warehouse space, 25,280 square feet of flex space and 554,194 square feet of specialized industrial space.

Since 2015 Leavenworth County has absorbed 551,246 square feet of industrial space with total new supply limited to just 81,000 square feet. Given these market dynamics the County’s overall vacancy rate has dropped from 12.0 percent at year-end 2014 to just 0.6 percent by mid-2019. Since 2016 the Leavenworth County industrial market has operated at a vacancy rate of 0.8 percent or less.

From 2019 through 2040, industrial-related job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to support the need for approximately 1.8 million to 2.2 million square feet of both owner-occupied and speculative industrial space.
Residential Housing Market Analysis

This section of the report evaluates the Leavenworth County’s existing housing stock by identifying such characteristics as total inventory of dwelling units, occupancies, age, and type of the existing housing inventory as well as recent trends in new housing construction activity. The goal is to identify current and future opportunities to support new housing stock in Leavenworth County.

Housing Stock Characteristics

The 2000 Census reported the Leavenworth County housing stock at 24,401 dwelling units. By the 2010 Census the County’s housing stock increased by 17.6 percent to 28,697 dwelling units. The County’s housing stock in 2018 was estimated at 29,991 dwelling units.

The table on the following page depicts the growth in housing units from 2000 through 2017 within Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. During this period the housing stock of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities increased by 22.6 percent, or 3,922 dwelling units. Since 2000, the four largest cities captured 79 percent of the total new housing inventory, with the small cities and unincorporated areas of the County supporting the remaining 21 percent. By 2017, Leavenworth County’s four largest cities accounted for 72.5 percent of the countywide housing stock, or 21,286 dwelling units.

With a current population estimated at 36,062 residents, Leavenworth is the largest city in Leavenworth County. Since 2000, Leavenworth’s housing stock grew by 811 dwelling units, or 7.1 percent.

Lansing is the County’s second largest urban center with a current population estimated at 11,964 residents. Since 2000, Lansing’s housing stock increased by 999 dwelling units, or 39.2 percent.
Basehor and Tonganoxie are located in the southern portion of Leavenworth County and are the most impacted communities by continued population and urban expansion of the Kansas City MSA. Since 2000, the housing stock increased by 1,047 dwelling units in Basehor and 1,065 dwelling units in Tonganoxie. Together, these cities captured 42.5 percent of the County’s new housing stock and 53.9 percent of the new housing units within the County’s four largest cities.

### Housing Stock Growth Trends Leavenworth County Cities; 2000-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth County</td>
<td>24,401</td>
<td>28,697</td>
<td>28,999</td>
<td>29,106</td>
<td>29,368</td>
<td>4,967</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>12,936</td>
<td>13,670</td>
<td>13,710</td>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>13,747</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>3,352</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basehor</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>1,916</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>123.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonganoxie</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>103.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,991</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of County Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

The table on the following page depicts annual single-family permitting volumes since 2014 for unincorporated Leavenworth County and the County’s four largest cities as provided by the Home Builders Association of Greater Kansas City.

From 2014 through July 2019, a reported 1,342 single-family homes were permitted for construction in Leavenworth County. The City of Basehor issued permits for 558 single-family homes since 2014, accounting for 41.6 percent of total permitting activity. Since 2014, a total of 423 single-family homes were permitted for construction in unincorporated Leavenworth County, translating into a market share of 31.5 percent. Tonganoxie experienced the third largest volume of single-family permits at 185 dwelling units, or 13.8 percent of the countywide total. New home construction since 2014 was modest in both Lansing and Leavenworth with total permitting volumes of 95 and 81 dwelling units, respectively.

Since 2014, unincorporated Leavenworth County has accounted for a growing volume and market share of countywide single-family home construction. From 54 dwelling units permitting in 2014 and a market share of 24.1 percent, single-family home permitting in unincorporated Leavenworth County reached a high of 96 dwelling units in 2017 for a market share of 36.8 percent. Through year-to-date July 2019, a reported 45 single-family homes were permitted for construction, equating to a 40.9 percent market share. The increasing residential construction pressures in unincorporated Leavenworth County is a principal reason that comprehensive and long-term urban planning is needed.
## Single-Family Home Permitting Trends
### Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2014 – July 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Leavenworth County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Single-Family Permits</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Countywide Total</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leavenworth County Cities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basehor</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonganoxie</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Countywide Total</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unit Permitted</strong></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Home Builders Association of Greater Kansas City.
The table below compares the age of the Leavenworth County housing stock with that of the State of Kansas as reported by the American Community Survey published by the U.S. Census Bureau. A reported 36 percent of Leavenworth County’s existing housing stock was built since 1990 compared to 27.2 percent statewide. The oldest housing built prior to 1940 accounts for 16.4 percent of the County’s total housing stock which is comparable to 16.7 percent statewide.

Leavenworth County’s housing stock is newer than that of the State of Kansas. The County’s stock of housing built since 1990 (36.0%) represents a much larger share than the statewide average (29.7%) and the stock of housing built prior to 1970 is lower than the statewide average. Leavenworth County’s newer housing stock is attributed to strong population growth over the past 25 years.

**Housing Stock by Year Built**
**Leavenworth County vs. State of Kansas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Structure Built</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>29,368</td>
<td>1,259,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 2014 of Later</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 2010 to 2013</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 2000 to 2009</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1990 to 1999</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1980 to 1989</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1970 to 1979</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1960 to 1969</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1950 to 1959</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1940 to 1949</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1939 or Earlier</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Detached single-family housing is Leavenworth County’s most prevalent housing product with a 77.6 percent share of the total inventory exceeding the statewide average of 72.7 percent. Multi-family housing with 10 or more dwelling units accounts for just 2.7 percent of the County housing stock compared to 8.3 percent for Kansas. Leavenworth County’s housing stock mix is influenced its rural character whereby the demand for-sale single-family housing exceeds that for attached rental housing.

### Leavenworth County Occupied Housing Stock by Type – 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units in Structure</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Kansas %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Unit, Detached</td>
<td>22,777</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Unit, Attached</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 Units</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Units</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 Units</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or More Units</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home and other Types of Housing</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2017.

The County’s urban areas consist of medium-density single family and small-scale multi-family housing product. Within the unincorporated areas large-lot single-family homes are the predominant housing type.
The table below depicts the housing stock composition for Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. Leavenworth is the largest city in Leavenworth County and supports the most diverse housing stock. Detached single-family homes account for just over two-thirds of Leavenworth’s housing stock compared to 77.6 percent countywide. Multi-family housing with three or more dwelling units per structure account for 15.1 percent of Leavenworth’s housing stock compared to 10.1 percent countywide. The above average share of multi-family housing in Leavenworth maybe attributed to the large military presence and modest household income levels.

Since 2000, Lansing’s housing stock has increased by 39.2 percent, adding 999 new dwelling units. Among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities, Lansing possesses the highest share of detached single-family homes at 81.6 percent of the total housing stock. Multi-family housing with three or more dwelling units per structure account for 10.1 percent of Lansing’s total housing stock, equal to the countywide average.

Since 2000, Basehor’s housing stock has increased by 123 percent in large part to the escalating impact of urban encroachment from the Kansas City MSA. Basehor has emerged as a bedroom community with detached single-family homes accounting for 79.5 percent of the total housing stock and multi-family housing with three or more dwelling units per structure accounting for just 6.2 percent, lowest among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. No multi-family structures with ten or more dwelling units are present in Basehor.

Since 2000, Tonganoxie’s housing stock has more than doubled, adding 1,065 new dwelling units. Tonganoxie’s housing composition includes 68.9 percent detached single-family homes, 9.2 percent attached single-family homes, 2.8 percent duplexes, 18.3 percent multi-family with 3 to 9 dwelling units per structure, and 0.9 percent mobile home or other housing type. No multi-family structures with ten or more dwelling units are present in Tonganoxie.

### Housing Stock Composition Leavenworth County Cities; 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units in Structure</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>29,368</td>
<td>13,747</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>2,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Unit, Detached</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Unit, Attached</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Units</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Units</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 Units</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ Units</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home or Other</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Since 2010, rental housing in Leavenworth County has gained market share. In 2010, owner-occupied units accounted for 69.4 percent of all occupied housing units with renter-occupied housing accounting for 30.6 percent. From 2010 to 2017, the inventory of renter-occupied housing increased by 10.2 percent or 804 dwelling units with the owner-occupied stock increased just 3.6 percent or 651 dwelling units. By 2017, rental housing accounted for 32 percent of the housing stock with owner-occupied reduced to 68 percent.

The graphic below depicts the owner-occupied versus renter-occupied housing mix for Leavenworth County’s four largest cities.
Among the county’s four largest cities, Leavenworth supports the highest rate of renter-occupied housing, due largely to the presence of the military and the lowest household income levels. Renter-occupied housing in Leavenworth accounts for 48.7 percent of all occupied dwelling units with owner-occupied accounting for just 51.3 percent.

Basehor maintains the highest level of owner-occupied housing, accounting for 78.1 percent of the total housing stock. The predominance of owner-occupied housing maybe attributed to the high level of new for-sale, single-family home construction in recent years. Renter-occupied housing accounts for just 21.9 percent of all occupied housing units as multi-family housing with 2 to 9 dwelling units per structure accounting for just 9.9 percent of the total housing stock.

Lansing and Tonganoxie both support similar housing tenure patterns with owner-occupied housing accounting for approximately 72 percent of the total occupied housing stock and renter-occupied accounting for the remaining 28 percent. Both cities have experienced considerable for-sale new home construction in recent years.

While Leavenworth County’s median housing value has remained relatively flat since 2010, it has consistently exceeded the statewide median. During 2017 the median housing value in Leavenworth County of $171,000 compared to $139,200 for Kansas. A reported 41.3 percent of the County’s housing is valued at $50,000 to $149,999 with 17.0 percent valued at $150,000 to $199,999. Housing valued under $50,000 accounts for 12.7 percent of the County’s housing stock.
The table below depicts the housing value distribution and median value for each of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. Based on value, each city supports a distinctive market positioning.

Leavenworth represents the county’s most affordable housing market with a median value for owner-occupied housing of $116,100 which compares to $171,000 countywide. Over 41 percent of Leavenworth’s owner-occupied housing units are valued at less than $100,000 with just 16.4 percent valued in excess of $200,000.

Basehor represents Leavenworth County’s most expensive housing market supporting a median value of $199,000. In recent years Basehor has experienced strong new home construction that has resulting in escalating median housing values. Just 4.7 percent of owner-occupied housing in Basehor is valued at less than $100,000 while 62.0 percent is valued at $150,000 to $299,999. New housing in generally priced from $200,000 to $300,000.

Since 2000, Tonganoxie has supported the highest level of new home construction in Leavenworth County with the housing stock increasing by 1,065 dwelling units. Part of the attraction of Tonganoxie’s housing market is the lower sales prices as compared to nearly Basehor. For 2017, the median housing value in Tonganoxie was reported by the U.S. Census Bureau at $162,000. Just 5.0 percent of owner-occupied housing in Tonganoxie is valued at less than $100,000 while 54.3 percent is valued at $100,000 to $199,999 and 27.0 percent valued at $200,000 to $299,999. Most new housing in Tonganoxie is priced in the mid- to high-$200’s.

Lansing supports a median housing value of $175,400, second highest among the county’s four largest cities. Nearly half of Lansing’s housing is valued from $150,000 to $299,999. Most active new subdivisions in Lansing are priced in excess of $300,000.

### Housing Value Distribution by Leavenworth County City; 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Range</th>
<th>Occupied Housing Units</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 - $299,999</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 - $499,999</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 - $999,999</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 or More</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>$171,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$162,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
From 2010 to 2017, Leavenworth County’s median monthly rent exceeded the statewide median. Since 2010, Leavenworth County’s median monthly rent increased 20.9 percent to $950 by 2017. Kansas’ median rent in 2017 of $801 per month was 15.7 percent below the median for Leavenworth County.

The table below depicts the monthly housing rent distribution and median monthly rent for each of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. Considerable disparities in monthly rent exists among each city.

**Monthly Housing Rent Distribution by Leavenworth County City; 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Rent Range</th>
<th>Leavenworth County</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>8,369</td>
<td>5,911</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $500</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 - $999</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 - $1,499</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 - $1,999</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 - $2,499</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 - $2,999</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or More</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Monthly Rent</strong></td>
<td><strong>$950</strong></td>
<td><strong>$942</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,042</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>$640</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Tonganoxie is the most affordable rental housing market among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities supporting a median monthly rent of just $640. Nearly 15 percent of occupied rental housing in Tonganoxie rents for less than $500 per month with 85.3 percent renting for $500 to $1,499 per month. The well below average market rents maybe attributed to the fact that structures with 2 to 4 dwelling units account for the bulk of Tonganoxie’s multi-family housing stock.

Similar to owner-occupied housing values, Basehor supports the most expensive housing rents, with a median rent of $1,076 per month. No occupied rental housing in Basehor maintains a median monthly rent of less than $500 with over 96 percent of occupied rental housing renting for $500 to $1,499 per month.

Leavenworth maintains the largest stock of renter-occupied housing among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. Leavenworth’s median monthly rent of $942 is comparable to the countywide median of $950 per month. A reported 7.4 percent of occupied rental housing in Leavenworth rents for less than $500 per month with over two-thirds renting for $500 to $1,499 per month. Given the military’s off-base housing allowance of $1,600 per month, 22.1 percent of Leavenworth’s occupied rental housing supports monthly rents of $1,500 to $1,999.

Lansing’s occupied rental housing supports an average monthly rent of $1,042 with 7.8 percent of the housing stock renting for less than $500 per month, 39.0 percent renting for $500 to $999 per month, and 43.0 percent renting for $1,000 to $1,999 per month. Lansing is the only city supporting housing rents exceeding $3,000 per month.

Homeowners in Leavenworth County are more likely to occupy detached single-family housing while renters generally occupy attached multi-family housing. Owner-occupied housing in Leavenworth County accounts for 68.0 percent of the entire occupied housing stock with renter-occupied accounting for 32.0 percent. By comparison, owner-occupied housing accounts for 66.4 percent of Kansas’ total occupied housing stock with renter-occupied accounting for 33.6 percent.

Leavenworth County Occupied Housing Stock by Type – 2017
Owner-Occupied vs. Renter-Occupied Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>18,532</td>
<td>8,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Unit, Detached</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Unit, Attached</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 Units</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Units</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or More Units</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home and other Types of Housing</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2017.
For 2017, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, of Leavenworth County’s total housing stock of 29,368 dwelling units, an estimated 27,233 dwelling units were occupied, including 18,532 owner-occupied housing units and 8,701 renter-occupied housing units. Detached single-family homes accounted for 95.6 percent of all occupied owner-occupied housing units. Meanwhile, renters were much less likely to occupy detached single-family homes accounting for just 42.3 percent of all occupied rental units.

Properties with 3 or 4 rental units were the most popular attached housing product for renters accounting for 11.8 percent of all renter-occupied units. Properties with 5 to 9 dwelling units account for 9.0 percent of all renter-occupied units. Meanwhile, structures with 10 or more rental units accounted for 7.6 percent of all renter-occupied units.

The table below segments monthly housing costs in Leavenworth County for both homeowners and renters as provided by the American Community Survey. The data illustrates a strong demand for affordable housing for both owner-occupied and rental housing. Nearly 35 percent of owner-occupied dwelling units possess a monthly housing cost of $300 to $799. Just 12.4 percent of owner-occupied housing has a cost of $2,000 or more per month. The average monthly cost for owner-occupied housing in Leavenworth County is $1,129.

Rental housing in Leavenworth County supports a comparable share of affordable units with 35.6 percent with monthly housing costs of under $800. The median renter-occupied housing cost of $950 per month is just 10 percent lower than the median cost for owner-occupied housing.

### Leavenworth County Monthly Housing Costs – 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>County Total</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>18,532</td>
<td>8,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $300</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 to $499</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 to $799</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 to $999</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,499</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,999</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 to $2,499</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $2,999</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or more</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$1,055</td>
<td>$1,129</td>
<td>$950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2017.
Conclusions

Over the past two decades Leavenworth County has experienced escalating urban pressures originating from the continued expansion of the Kansas City MSA with the four largest cities capturing the bulk of population, employment, and urban growth. Each city supports distinctive for-sale and rental housing markets which has added to the county’s capture of urban growth. From 2000 through 2018, Leavenworth County’s housing stock increased by 22.9 percent, adding 5,590 dwelling units.

Basehor and Tonganoxie located in the southern portion of Leavenworth County have been the most impacted communities by Kansas City’s continued urban expansion. Together from 2000 to 2017 these cities captured 42.5 percent of the countywide inventory of new housing units and 53.9 percent of the new housing units within the County’s four largest cities.

The Leavenworth housing market is the County’s largest and most diverse and is heavily influenced by the large military presence. From 2000 to 2017, the volume of new home construction in Leavenworth was the lowest among the county’s four largest cities, adding 811 dwelling units. Renter-occupied housing in Leavenworth accounts for 48.7 percent of all occupied dwelling units with owner-occupied accounting for just 51.3 percent. Leavenworth represents the county’s most affordable housing market with a median value for owner-occupied housing of $116,100 and a median monthly rent of $942. Approximately 41 percent of Leavenworth’s owner-occupied housing units are valued at less than $100,000 with just 16.4 percent values in excess of $200,000. Nearly 55 percent of renter-occupied housing possesses a monthly rent of less than a $1,000.

Since 2000, Basehor has added 1,047 new housing units. Detached single-family homes account for 79.5 percent of the total housing stock and multi-family housing with three or more dwelling units per structure accounting for just 6.2 percent, lowest among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities. No multi-family structures with ten or more dwelling units are present in Basehor. At 78.1 percent, Basehor supports the highest level of owner-occupied housing. Basehor represents Leavenworth County’s most expensive housing market supporting a median value of $199,000 and a median monthly rent of $1,076. Just 4.7 percent of owner-occupied housing in Basehor is valued at less than $100,000 while 62.0 percent is valued at $150,000 to $299,999. No occupied rental housing in Basehor maintains a median monthly rent of less than $500 with over 96 percent of occupied rental housing renting for $500 to $1,499 per month.

Since 2000, Lansing has added 999 new dwelling units. Among Leavenworth County’s four largest cities, Lansing possesses the highest share of detached single-family homes at 81.6 percent of the total housing stock. Owner-occupied housing accounts for 72.7 percent of Lansing’s occupied housing stock. Lansing’s median housing value of $175,400 is second highest among the county’s four largest cities. Nearly half of Lansing’s housing is valued from $150,000 to $299,999. Lansing’s median monthly rent of $1,042 is also the second highest with 43.0 percent of the housing stock renting for $1,000 to $1,999 per month.

Since 2000, Tonganoxie’s housing stock has more than doubled, adding 1,065 new dwelling units. Tonganoxie’s housing composition includes 68.9 percent detached single-family homes, 9.2 percent attached single-family homes, and 21.1 percent 2 to 9 dwelling units per structure. No multi-family structures with ten or more dwelling units are present in Tonganoxie. Owner-
occupied housing accounts for 72.3 percent of Tonganoxie’s occupied housing stock. Part of the attraction of Tonganoxie’s owner-occupied housing market is affordable values with a median housing value of $162,000. Over 54 percent of owner-occupied housing is valued at $100,000 to $199,999 and 27.0 percent is valued at $200,000 to $299,999. Tonganoxie is the most affordable rental housing market supporting a median monthly rent of $640. Nearly 15 percent of occupied rental housing in Tonganoxie rents for less than $500 per month with 85.3 percent renting for $500 to $1,499 per month.

Since 2014, unincorporated Leavenworth County has accounted for a growing volume and market share of countywide single-family home construction. From 54 dwelling units permitting in 2014 and a market share of 24.1 percent, single-family home permitting in unincorporated Leavenworth County reached a high of 96 dwelling units in 2017 for a market share of 36.8 percent. Through year-to-date July 2019, a reported 45 single-family homes were permitted for construction, equating to a 40.9 percent market share.

**Leavenworth County Apartment Market**

According to the Home Builders Association of Greater Kansas City, since 2014 no building permits have been issued in Leavenworth County for the construction of new apartment properties. In recent years, adaptive re-use of former industrial buildings and schools in the City of Leavenworth has added 440 new apartment units.

According to CoStar, Leavenworth County has 19 large-scale apartment properties supporting a total of 835 dwelling units. No new properties have been constructed over the past decade. Multi-family properties with 20 or more dwelling units account for 2.5 percent of the housing stock for both Leavenworth and Lansing with Basehor and Tonganoxie having no large-scale apartments.

From 2010 through 2014, the overall vacancy rate for Leavenworth County’s large-scale apartment properties ranged from 6.0 percent to 6.5 percent. By 2015 and 2016 the market had weakened with vacancies reaching 8.1 percent to 8.7 percent. Since then the market has recovered with vacancies operating at healthy levels ranging from 3.7 percent to 4.0 percent.
From 2010 through 2014, due to healthy occupancy levels the average rent in Leavenworth County escalated by 8.0 percent. In response to escalating vacancies the average rent declined in 2015. As the market has recovered rents again have been on the rise.

Adaptive re-use of former factory buildings and schools in the City of Leavenworth have recently added 440 new market-rate apartments. The 150-unit Stove Factory Lofts offers luxury apartment features and such amenities as a clubhouse, fitness center, and business center. Monthly rents are $600 to $895 for studios, $950 to $1,025 for one-bedrooms, $1,200 to $2,000 for 2-bedrooms, and $1,300 to $1,500 for 3-bedroom models. The 130-unit Station Lofts are renting one-bedroom units at $950 to $1,100 per month and 2-bedroom models for $1,200 to $1,400 per month.

The new loft conversion apartments in Leavenworth have achieved high occupancy levels and above market rents. This strong market performance, coupled with the overall market’s low vacancy rate, suggests that new supply in Leavenworth County is supportable.

**Forecast Housing Demand**

Residential housing demand estimates for Leavenworth County through the year 2040 were forecast based on anticipated demographic and economic trends for the community. Key input to the model includes historical patterns in annual residential building permit activity and projected population and household growth, average household formation rates, households by income levels, and population by age.

Demographic characteristics and historic population growth trends for Leavenworth County were provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. Housing characteristics for Leavenworth County were provided by the *American Community Survey*. Population growth projections for Leavenworth County were generated by Canyon Research Southwest based on historic growth patterns, location at the fringe of the Kansas City MSA, existing employment base, and economic development factors.
According to the *American Community Survey*, Leavenworth County maintains 29,368 residential housing units. The existing housing units were operating at an overall occupancy rate of 92.7 percent. The occupied housing stock included 18,532 owner-occupied units (68%) and 8,701 renter-occupied units (32%). A total of 2,135 vacant housing units were reported. Leavenworth County’s average household size is 2.69 persons.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Leavenworth County’s July 1, 2018 population was estimated at 81,352 residents. The County’s 2019 population is estimated at 83,152 residents. By 2040, Leavenworth County’s population is forecast to reach 102,340 residents, generating demand for additional housing units.

From 2019 through 2040, the Leavenworth County population is forecast to increase by 19,188 residents, equating to the demand for an estimated 7,080 to 7,325 new occupied housing units. Given the region’s population age composition, household income levels, and existing housing stock, from 2019 through 2040 the housing demand is estimated to be segmented 68 percent owner-occupied and 32 percent renter occupied. Therefore, by 2040 the mix of new housing demand is estimated at 4,815 to 4,980 owner-occupied units and 2,265 to 2,345 rental units. The table below summarizes the forecast housing mix by owner- and renter-occupied and by product type.

### Forecast Housing Demand by Product Type
Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2019-2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
<th>2040 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Units</td>
<td># of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>29,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>27,233</td>
<td>7,080 - 7,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>18,532</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>8,701</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>22,777</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 Units</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Units</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or More Units</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home or Other</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census and Canyon Research Southwest, Inc.
Conclusions

The Leavenworth County retail inventory totals 2.6 million square feet of space, equating to just 31 square feet of occupied retail space per capita compared to 56 square feet per capita for the Kansas City MSA. From a high of 6.7 percent in 2017, the County’s retail vacancy rate has reached a healthy 1.8 percent.

Since 2010, Leavenworth County has suffered from considerable retail sales leakage supporting an annual pull factor ranging from 0.54 to 0.59. Leavenworth County’s high rate of retail sales leakage is a symptom of modest population levels, presence at the urban fringe, and proximity to larger and more diverse retail destinations in the Kansas City MSA.

Leavenworth County supports 957,911 square feet of professional office space. Since 2015, 116,175 square feet of net office space has been absorbed with no new construction reported. As a result, the overall vacancy rate has gradually improved from 15.1 percent in 2015 to 9.7 percent by the second quarter of 2019.

The inventory of industrial space in Leavenworth County totals 4.22 million square feet. Since 2015, 551,246 square feet of industrial space has been absorbed with new supply limited to just 81,000 square feet. Since 2016, the Leavenworth County industrial market has operated at a vacancy rate of 0.8 percent or less.

Leavenworth County’s housing stock in 2018 was estimated at 29,991 dwelling units. Detached single-family homes account for 77.6 percent of the County’s housing stock with attached multi-family properties with 10+ dwelling units accounting for just 2.7 percent. Leavenworth County’s housing stock mix is influenced by its rural character whereby the demand for sale single-family housing significantly exceeds that for attached rental housing. In terms of housing type, composition, values, and rents, Leavenworth County’s four largest cities support very distinctive housing markets. The diverse housing stock will assist Leavenworth County in capturing continued employment, population, and urban growth stemming from future expansion of the Kansas City MSA.

Leavenworth County has 19 large-scale apartment properties supporting a total of 835 dwelling units. By mid-2019 the large-scale apartment properties were operating at a healthy vacancy rate of 4.0 percent and an average rent of $720 per month. No new large-scale apartment properties have been constructed over the past decade.

Since 2010, Leavenworth County’s median housing value and median monthly rent have consistently exceeded the statewide median. During 2017, the median housing value in Leavenworth County of $171,000 compared to $139,200 for Kansas while the median housing rent of $950 per month exceeded the statewide median of $801 per month.

Leavenworth County’s owner-occupied housing stock is dominated by moderate-priced product with 41.3 percent of the housing valued at $50,000 to $149,999 and 17.0 percent valued at $150,000 to $199,999. Affordable housing valued under $50,000 accounts for 12.7 percent of the County’s housing stock. Conversely, just 14.7 percent of the Leavenworth County housing stock is valued at $300,000 or more.
MARKET POSITIONING STRATEGY

The primary objective of the *Economic and Market Analysis* was to evaluate the impact of demographic, economic, and real estate market trends on future urban development patterns in Leavenworth County, Kansas.

Based on the study findings potential urban growth opportunities for Leavenworth County through 2040 are identified, including:

- Identify opportunities and constraints impacting future land use patterns within Leavenworth County;
- Forecast reasonably achievable demand through 2040 in Leavenworth County for new retail, office and industrial space as well as residential housing by product type; and
- Identify prospective future land use and development patterns for Leavenworth County given the location and character of existing urban areas, physical characteristics, transportation network, and market demand.

Opportunities and Constraints

Through stakeholder interviews and other primary research opportunities and constraints in the future development of Leavenworth County were identified and summarized in the text below.

Opportunities

- Leavenworth County’s location in the path of the Kansas City MSA’s urban growth has resulted in an 18.4 percent growth in population since 2000, adding approximately 12,661 new residents. Leavenworth County is expected to capture continued population and employment growth stemming from expansion of the metropolitan Kansas City area;
- Employment growth at Village West has resulted in modest new housing demand in Leavenworth County. As Village West and surrounding properties continue to develop Leavenworth County is expected to experience increased impact;
- Leavenworth County’s four largest cities are forecast to capture the bulk of employment, population, and urban growth through the year 2040. The existing cities offer a sense of community and the needed support services;
- Leavenworth County benefits from an extensive highway system and proximity to Kansas City International Airport. Much of the urban growth through the year 2040 in Leavenworth County will follow the existing transportation corridors (i.e., Highways 24 and State Routes 1 and 7);
- The status of U.S. Highway 24 and State Routes 1 and 7 as major transportation corridors improves the potential to support commercial, office, industrial and multi-family residential housing;
• Large landholdings exist at the urban edges of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities, providing the opportunity for comprehensive and cohesive land use planning. Emphasis must be placed on assuring compatibility between existing low-density residential land uses and future urban development;

• Continued employment-related development will be critical to support Leavenworth County’s long-term economic and fiscal sustainability;

• Tourism and lodging industries can be increasing contributors to the Leavenworth County economy;

• A critical component of Leavenworth County’s long-term economic health is to expand the industrial base. Four shovel-ready business parks operate in Leavenworth County, highlighted by the new 135-acre Tonganoxie Business Park and 82-acre Leavenworth Business & Tech Park. Long-term industrial and business park development in Leavenworth County is expected to occur along the principal transportation corridors of U.S. Highway 24, Interstate 70, and State Route 1 (affords direct access to Interstate 70);

• Flood plain lands or those in proximity to existing low-density residential within the unincorporated county can be utilized for open space and recreational use;

• Leavenworth County’s population is well educated which is a major asset in attracting new businesses and stimulating job growth;

• Leavenworth County maintains a high quality of life that is an asset in attracting new residents and businesses;

• Affordable for-sale housing costs with each of Leavenworth County’s four major cities targeting differing price points;

• Housing opportunities range from for-sale and rental housing within Leavenworth County’s four largest cities to country living in unincorporated portions of the county;

• There is a lack of quality market-rate apartments in Leavenworth County with sufficient demand to support new supply;

• Each of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities have adopted Comprehensive Plans that include future growth area boundaries and prospective land uses; and

• It is a priority to design a flexible, evolving land use policy capable of adapting to a changing economy, demographics and real estate market;

Constraints

• A limited inventory of professional office and industrial space in Leavenworth County is available for immediate occupancy. In addition, there are no shovel-ready parcels of more than 40 acres in size or shovel-ready industrial parcels offering rail service;
• Limited direct vehicular access to I-70 and I-435. North-south travel through Leavenworth County is also limited;

• Proximity to Village West and Zona Rosa places a major constraint in attracting major retail development to Leavenworth County;

• In recent years for-sale single-family housing has accounted for most of the new construction in Leavenworth County;

• Leavenworth County’s low unemployment rate places constraints on the availability of labor;

• In attracting business Leavenworth County suffers from limited funding levels and resources and faces stiff competition from other cities within the Kansas City MSA and beyond;

• Absence of infrastructure in the unincorporated areas of Leavenworth County required to support urban development;

• The ability of Leavenworth County’s four largest cities to provide the infrastructure necessary to support future urban growth;

• Leavenworth County’s lack of design standards/building codes conflicts with city guidelines, placing constraints in the ability to incorporate the County’s existing urban development;

• Leavenworth County suffers from parochialism in the form of north versus south, urban versus rural, and city versus city;

• Leavenworth County lacks a diversified employment base that is heavily reliant on federal, state, and local government;

• Leavenworth County has a limited inventory of active new home subdivisions and large builders hesitate to enter the market;

• The County tax base is hampered by the federal and state government’s large landholdings that are tax exempt;

• Single-family homes account for the bulk of Leavenworth County’s housing stock with a limited inventory of quality market-rate apartment communities;

• The City of Leavenworth is landlocked in three directions with future urban expansion confined to the west; and

• Possible land use conflicts with future urban growth and existing low-density residential and agriculture uses.
Forecast Commercial, Industrial and Residential Demand

Retail, office and industrial space and residential housing unit demand was forecast for Leavenworth County, Kansas through the year 2040. Market forces driving future demand for commercial space and housing include the growth in employment, population, and income along with trends in average space per employee, household size, and household composition.

By 2040 Leavenworth County’s population is forecast to increase by 19,183 new residents. This increased population is forecast to generate additional retail sales capable of supporting approximately 594,000 to 674,000 square feet of new retail space by 2040.

From 2019 through 2040, office-related job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to support the demand for approximately 307,000 to 345,000 square feet of both owner-occupied and speculative office space.

By 2040 industrial-related job growth in Leavenworth County is projected to support the demand for approximately 1.8 million to 2.2 million square feet of both owner-occupied and speculative industrial space.

### Forecast Retail, Office, Industrial and Residential Demand
Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2019 to 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Growth Population</th>
<th>2019-2040 Jobs</th>
<th>Net Conservative</th>
<th>Gain Optimistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>19,188</td>
<td></td>
<td>594,000 SF</td>
<td>674,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td></td>
<td>307,000 SF</td>
<td>345,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,790,000 SF</td>
<td>2,237,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>19,188</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,080 Units</td>
<td>7,325 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,815 Units</td>
<td>4,980 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,265 Units</td>
<td>2,345 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through 2040, new housing demand in Leavenworth County is forecast at 7,080 to 7,325 occupied dwelling units. The mix of future housing demand is best determined by evaluating Leavenworth County’s population demographics with that of the various housing life-cycle stages. Emphasis is placed on age, education, and income.

Entry-level householders are generally single or couples without children in their early 20’s and often prefer to rent basic, inexpensive apartments. Residents 15 to 24 years of age account for 12.2 percent of the Leavenworth County population with those 25 to 34 years of age accounting for 18.4 percent. Individuals with high school degrees or less are more likely to be renters than homeowners. An estimated 36.9 percent of Leavenworth County residents are high school graduates or less. Leavenworth County large young adult population provides a strong market for entry-level rental housing.
An estimated 23.0 percent of households in Leavenworth County (6,265 households) earn less than $35,000 annually with 7.9 percent of households (2,152 households) earning less than $15,000. These households tend to be perpetual renters with the lowest income households potentially qualifying for some form of housing assistance. Leavenworth County’s resident profile suggests an additional need for rental housing with an emphasis on income-based product.

First-time homebuyers and move-up renters are usually married or cohabitating couples in their mid-20’s or 30’s, some with children, but most are without children. These individuals prefer to purchase modest-priced single-family homes or rent more upscale apartments. An estimated 10,726 residents of Leavenworth County are 25 to 34 years of age with 4,439 residents attaining an associate degree and 9,459 residents possess a bachelor’s degree. An estimated 3,334 households earn $35,000 to $49,999 annually and 5,282 households earn $50,000 to $74,999 annually. Leavenworth County possesses a sizable market for first-time homebuyers with homes priced from $125,000 to $275,000 and move-up renters.

Move-up homebuyers are typically in their late 30’s to 40’s, married with children. There is a total of 9,267 households in Leavenworth County with children. An estimated 11,904 residents of Leavenworth County are 35 to 44 years of age with 9,459 residents attaining a bachelor’s degree and 7,160 residents possessing a graduate or professional degree. An estimated 4,224 households earn $75,000 to $99,999 annually; 5,184 households earn $100,000 to $149,999 annually; and 2,944 households earn $150,000 or more annually. Leavenworth County possesses a sizable move-up market for housing priced at $300,000 and more.

Through population growth new housing demand from 2019 through 2040 in Leavenworth County is estimated at 7,080 to 7,325 dwelling units. Leavenworth County’s current mix of occupied housing units is approximately 68 percent owner-occupied and 32 percent renter occupied. Given Leavenworth County’s demographic profile and latent demand for affordable housing this report estimates that through 2040, the mix of new housing demand is estimated at 4,815 to 4,980 owner-occupied dwelling units and 2,265 to 2,345 renter-occupied dwelling units. The housing mix by product type is summarized in the table below.

### Forecast Residential Demand by Housing Type
**Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2019 to 2040**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Forecast # of Units</th>
<th>Demand Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached Single-Family</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5,310</td>
<td>5,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Single-Family</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 Units</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Units</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ Units</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home and Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>7,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assuming an average floor-area-ratio (“FAR”) of 0.2 to 0.4 for the retail, office and industrial space and an average density of 4.0 dwelling units per acre, through 2040 Leavenworth County is estimated support the development of approximately 1,965 to 2,088 acres of land.

### Forecast Land Area Absorption in Acres
**Leavenworth County, Kansas; 2019 to 2040**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Conservative Scenario</th>
<th>Optimistic Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,965</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,088</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Land Use Patterns

In recent years urban growth within Leavenworth County has largely been influenced by the continued expansion of the Kansas City MSA and its location in the path of growth. Through 2040, urban development and population growth is expected to continue in Leavenworth County, favoring the southern portion of the County.

The communities of Basehor, Tonganoxie, Lansing, and Leavenworth are forecast to capture the bulk of future population, employment, and urban growth through the year 2040. The unincorporated areas closest to these cities will also continue to support new home construction and population growth. The central and northern portions of the County are expected to remain primarily agricultural.

Leavenworth County’s large land area, natural resources, and transportation system afford the opportunity to create a blend of urban and rural environments that provides the template for Leavenworth County and its principal population and economic centers to adapt to future trends in land use, economics, demographics, and transportation. The goal is to establish a land use plan that allows for continued urban growth and establishes a seamless transition from the County’s existing urban areas into adjacent unincorporated lands. Future urban growth should be sustainable featuring the optimal mix of complimentary land uses, transportation network, infrastructure, economic activity, housing, and land use flexibility. Emphasis should be placed on strengthening the urban centers and retaining the rural character of outlying lands.

To accommodate future development within Leavenworth County urban growth boundaries should be established surrounding the County’s largest cities that extend outside the existing municipal boundaries with emphasis placed on areas where infrastructure currently exists or is planned for expansion. Additional infrastructure investment within the urban growth areas will be required to accommodate future urban growth.
Most of the land designated for residential use within the urban growth areas should consist of low to medium density single-family housing closest to the existing city boundaries and rural residential at the periphery. Attached housing product is suitable adjacent to or in proximity to existing multi-family housing located within the city limits. The balance of the County’s unincorporated land located outside of the urban growth boundaries is best suited for a mix of large lot rural residential and agricultural uses.

Land adjacent to commercial and employment nodes should be designated for mixed density residential uses allowing for a variety of densities for both detached single-family and attached housing product.

Leavenworth County’s future housing stock should provide for a variety of for-sale and rental housing options and price ranges.

Create commercial and employment opportunities designed to ensure Leavenworth County’s long-term economic and fiscal sustainability. Future economic development efforts should focus on targeting high-growth sectors of the local economy such as bio science, animal health, cyber security, food processing, advanced and light manufacturing, and distribution. Future commercial and employment nodes would be best positioned along major transportation corridors.

The designated urban growth areas should include commercial nodes capable of facilitating a variety of retail development formats. Prospective commercial nodes include: 1) the U.S. Highway 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie; 2) State Highway 7 corridor between Basehor and Lansing; and 3) intersection of U.S. Highway 24 and County Route 1. Neighborhood commercial development opportunities will also occur within the urban growth areas in response to continued new home construction and population growth.

In addition to the four active business parks currently operating in Leavenworth County, prospective future major employment nodes include: 1) the U.S. Highway 24/40 corridor between Basehor and Tonganoxie; 2) County Road 1 corridor north and south of Interstate 70; 3) Eisenhower Road corridor; and 4) State Highway 7 corridor between Basehor and Lansing.

Future development within the designated urban growth areas should meet building design and code standards established by the corresponding city. Roads built in new residential neighborhoods should also meet city standards.

Create parks and open space as multi-use destinations. Designate flood plain areas as open space, trails, and recreational uses. The open space network would create a desirable recreational amenity and location for future residential housing.

County Road 1 maintains the only I-70 interchange in Leavenworth County. Future transportation plans should include constructing additional I-70 interchanges that will improve vehicular access and the ability to support future commercial and employment uses.

Direct east-west access from Leavenworth and Lansing to North Kansas City and I-435 is currently provided via Highways 5, 45, and 92. These routes are inefficient and lack capacity. A possible option to improve east-west access would be the extension of Highway 152 west from its current termination at I-435.
Additional north-south arterials are needed to promote improved vehicular access between the north and south areas of Leavenworth County.
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To accomplish great things we must dream as well as act.

Anatole France
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Leavenworth County is at a crossroads. No longer is it considered a rural county, per its federal classification. Development pressures are on the rise. But, peaceful, picturesque, rolling lands - as shown below - still make up most of the county land. With the current Comprehensive Plan dating back to 2008, the time is now to update the vision and goals of the county to reflect its changing nature. Ultimately, the goal of this effort is to ensure Leavenworth County can continue to grow in a sustainable way that fulfills the needs of its residents and preserves the integrity of its rural areas.

To do this, Leavenworth County is undertaking a countywide comprehensive planning process. Comprehensive planning is a way to engage all members of the county to create a consensus-built vision for the future.

The updated Comprehensive Plan (Plan) will address a variety of topics, including future land use, zoning, infrastructure, urban growth, economic development, and agriculture. This Plan must reflect the needs of the whole county. The visioning workshop was one such opportunity to begin to understand the needs, wants, and desires of those currently living in the county.
The Comprehensive Plan will provide policy guidance for all of unincorporated Leavenworth County, and will balance the needs of the various incorporated municipalities, clarifying their growth management areas.
Why Visioning?

Visioning serves as a critical milestone in any planning process. Not only is the visioning workshop the first in-person opportunity for community members, stakeholders, and city/county staff members to join together, it is the time when the collective tone for the process to come is set. The ultimate goal of visioning is to guide the development of the plan, ensuring it is reflective of overarching community goals.

While it is imperative to be realistic about what can be reasonably implemented, visioning is a time when participants are encouraged to ignore the price tag and timing concerns. The process is meant to uncover needs, wants, and desires without being clouded by the constraints, at least initially. Visioning intentionally strips away what often holds people back from being truly honest about what they want to see. This is a time to be playful and let go of the “ifs,” “buts,” and “hows” – it is a time to dream.

Once the needs, wants, and desires of the community have been fully explored, the constraints and roadblocks can be discussed. With the dream in mind and the openness that comes from sharing with one another about what is desired, a more informed conversation can be had about impediments, obstacles, and dislikes.

In addition to providing a dedicated time and space for members of the public to participate actively in the visioning process, this time is also imperative for the planning team, allowing them the opportunity to listen intently to what the community hopes to achieve from the project. Although the facilitated dialogue and exercises provide rich input, the act of simply listening to conversations being had between neighbors, acquaintances, and government staff members/officials with their constituents is invaluable to shaping the Plan.
Visioning Workshop Overview

Before a comprehensive plan’s vision and ultimate plan can be crafted, it is important to meet with members of the public to (1) ensure a clear understanding of their desires for the future of their community; (2) to gather local knowledge related to the issues and opportunities facing their community; and (3) to build consensus around a multifaceted solution. As the first step in this comprehensive planning process, a visioning workshop was held by the planning team.

The visioning workshop was held on May 23, 2019 at the Basehor Community Library (1400 158th Street, Basehor, KS 66007). Attendees included the planning team (consultant team and Leavenworth County Planning and Zoning Department), Stakeholder and Citizen Advisory Committee (SCAC) members, and Technical Committee (TC) members.

The SCAC is made up of county property owners, business owners, and other key stakeholders who have a vested interest in the future of Leavenworth County. Membership on the SCAC was open to any Leavenworth County resident interested in serving in such a capacity. The TC is made up representatives from various county agencies that would, in part, be responsible for implementing portions of the Comprehensive Plan.

Agenda

Introduction
- Who we are (consultant team)
- Overview of Comprehensive Plan
- Project schedule

Setting the Table
- Preliminary existing conditions
- Pep talk

Defining Success Exercises
- Word cloud
- Needs, wants, and desires
- Impediments, obstacles, and dislikes

Wrap-Up
- Upcoming events
The first in-person engagement event was the visioning workshop, which set the tone and direction for the planning process. The planning team met with the SCAC and TC from 3:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. that day. The goal of this workshop was to determine the impediments and obstacles facing the county and the needs, wants, and desires of county residents.

The visioning workshop was a critical time for the planning team to listen intently to what county residents envision for Leavenworth County in the future and what they hope to achieve from this project. This dialogue was facilitated through a variety of exercises that helped the SCAC and TC put their ideas into words.

In preparation for the visioning workshop, the planning team prepared select maps to illustrate the existing conditions throughout the county, created a project website (www.lvcountyplan.com), and visited the county multiple times. These matters were presented to both committees at the visioning workshop, allowing all participants to provide input on and ask questions about these initial findings. This presentation permitted everyone to work from the same base understanding of the current conditions of the county. After presenting this information, the planning team led a series of exercises. These sessions are described and illustrated in the following subsections.
Session Summaries

Word Cloud

The first exercise simply asked the participants - in one word - what made them most proud about Leavenworth County. Participants responded on sheets of paper and the planning team quickly compiled the responses into a word cloud. The larger the word size in a word cloud, the more times it was repeated as a response to the question. Word clouds are helpful in finding similar trains of thought between respondents.

Trends that emerged included the SCAC and TC’s appreciation for the county’s rural nature, diversity, and friendly people. The word cloud is illustrated below.
Session Summaries

Needs, Wants, and Desires / Impediments, Obstacles, and Dislikes

The next exercise asked participants members to use sticky notes to write down their (1) needs, wants, and desires and (2) impediments, obstacles, and dislikes for the county, defined as follows:

1. Needs: We need to address this critical issue.
2. Wants: If we had the choice, we would choose to have this...
3. Desires: Wouldn’t it be nice if..., but if we don’t get it, that’s okay.
4. Impediments: Immovable objects or obstructions that we must go around.
5. Obstacles: Things that can be surmounted or changed (hopefully in our best interest); get in the way of what we want to accomplish (but not just a nuisance).
6. Dislikes: Things we just do not like; tend to be nuisances and personal; do not prevent you from achieving your goals.

The entire group was given ample time to record their responses on individual sticky notes, and then stick each one on the appropriate sheet - needs, wants, desires, impediments, obstacles, and dislikes. All of these responses are recorded in Full Documentation of Responses.

After everyone had finished, the planning team split the participants into six groups by having the participants number off, one through six. From there, each group cycled through each station (one each for needs, wants, desires, impediments, obstacles, and dislikes) and reviewed everyone’s responses. During the second cycle through, the planning team instructed each group to pick their top three favorite responses of each category, and place those responses on their own group sheet. This exercise began the narrowing process to determine which items were most important. Then, each group chose a spokesperson to report back their priorities to the entire group. The following tables detail each groups’ priorities.

Group #1 Priorities

**Needs**
- High speed internet in rural areas – not “5G”
- Roads
- Mental health services

**Wants**
- Parks
- Secure agriculture zones
- More law enforcement

**Desires**
- Public areas that leverage the land – camping, fishing, mountain biking, etc.
- Technical education center, skilled crafts development
- Light industry that does not pollute or threaten the county’s beauty

**Impediments**
- Lack of plan
- Lacking industrial tax base
- Do not let the improvements of county be hampered by fiefdoms of the cities/towns

**Obstacles**
- 12 stoplights along HW7
- Good old boy network
- Public transportation

**Dislikes**
- History of things happening without community input
- Incomplete business plans released (or not) to public
- Allowing developers to buy parcels outside city limits in rural areas and expecting to build high density communities
Group #2 Priorities

**Needs**
- Greater economic development
- North south major arterials through center and north county
- Adoption of building codes

**Wants**
- Parks
- Pave the roads
- High speed internet in rural areas

**Desires**
- Floodplain management
- North/south roads
- Rural community

**Impediments**
- Leaders with personal agendas rather than community well being goals
- County zoning as currently written
- Stranger Creek bridges

**Obstacles**
- Lack of sewer/water infrastructure
- County administrative/staff adverse to working with cities
- Money

**Dislikes**
- Subdivisions in rural areas
- That cities have been given power to impose control over property owners 3 miles outside city limits without permission of land owners
- Commercial within 25-feet of residential development (in county)

Group #3 Priorities

**Needs**
- Building codes
- Infrastructure – sewer
- Better access to major highways

**Wants**
- Better mental health access
- Preservation of open space
- New access (e.g., bridge, roads)

**Desires**
- Tech schools
- Recreational areas
- Commercial/business

**Impediments**
- Poor tax base
- "Keep it the way it is" mentality
- Stranger Creek

**Obstacles**
- Poor infrastructure standards
- Short sighted tax policy
- Lack of high speed internet in rural areas

**Dislikes**
- Bureaucracy
- Too many water districts
- This is people thing – lots of real provincialism, inability to cooperate among entities
Group #4 Priorities

**Needs**
- Improved road system
- Preserve natural beauty and resources
- Easy access to high speed internet

**Wants**
- Walk/bike trail systems
- Well planned infrastructure - sewer/water/roads
- Encourage equality (LGBTQ)

**Desires**
- Hiking and biking trails through wooded areas
- Community center
- STEM development center for ALL ages

**Impediments**
- Lack of high paying jobs
- Internet
- Lack of economical development to offset tax base

**Obstacles**
- Number of stops on Highway 7
- Roads/terrain
- Lack of forward thinking

**Dislikes**
- Lack of consideration for property owners rights
- Lack of vision
- Lack of code enforcement

---

Group #5 Priorities

**Needs**
- Mental health services
- Climate sensitive
- Economic development

**Wants**
- Transportation plan for 5, 10, 20 year growth projections
- Rural/urban balance
- County park

**Desires**
- High speed internet
- Building codes
- More options for recycling

**Impediments**
- Idea that industry is the only type of economic development we can have
- River x 2
- Military fort and prisons (take away some revenue, but use roads, pay no taxes, etc.)

**Obstacles**
- City/county divided interests
- Small tax base
- Cost of infrastructure (water, sewer, roads)

**Dislikes**
- Secret deals with developers
- Leavenworth County Planning and Zoning notification process
- Lack of infrastructure in rural developments. Awkward land use when all development follows the road sides.
Group #6 Priorities

**Needs**

- Rural internet
- Economic development
- Infrastructure

**Wants**

- Parks
- Locally owned businesses, restaurants
- Good tax base (industrial)

**Desires**

- Retail
- Well defined paths of communication (government to citizens, citizens to government)
- More trails, trails connectivity

**Impediments**

- River, Stranger Creek, bridges, floodplain
- Climate change
- Egos

**Obstacles**

- Metro access, river crossing
- Conservative base of people – not forward thinking
- Differing opinions on what is needed

**Dislikes**

- Planning and Zoning tells you a policy and then you see others not following. Inconsistent.
- Friction between cities and county
- Too much commercial/industrial property in rural areas
What is Next?

This summer and fall are full of opportunities to engage with the comprehensive planning process. See the list of opportunities as follows:

• The community public survey is live on www.lvcountyplan.com, and will be open until September 1.

• Multiple focus groups are being hosted in June on a variety of topics. Check out www.lvcountyplan.com to learn more and sign up.

• Sign up for project update emails on the project website or follow along on social media (@lvcountyplan).

• The planning workshop will be on October 1-3, which will include a community open house on the evening of October 2.

The planning team will continue with their existing conditions study of the county, including a study of demographic, market, and economic conditions within the county.

Reach out to the planning team at any point with questions and comments by emailing compplan@leavenworthcounty.org.

Stay Connected!

www.lvcountyplan.com
Sign up for project updates

@lvcountyplan
Follow along for project updates
**Needs**

- Dust control or paved roads
- Easy access to high speed internet
- Access to K-10
- Successful locally owned businesses
- High speed internet in rural areas – not "5G"
- Road paving gets done
- Destinations for others counties, but locally owned
- Rural internet
- Economic development
- Preserve rural atmosphere
- Transportation
- Economic development
- Improved road system
- Jobs
- Need grocery store in north
- Affordable housing
- Rural internet and communications
- Inner structure
- Greater economic development
- Planned zoning
- Roads
- Infrastructure – improved roads, gravel to paved or chip-seal
- Protection of local ecology and environment
- Maintenance of peaceful rural quality of life
- Preserve natural beauty and resources
- High speed internet
- More arterial roads connecting the north
- Climate sensitive
- Public transportation
- Better access to north half of county
- Road improvement
- Infrastructure – sewer
- Mental health services
- Development that is sustainable
- Progressive/open minded
- More willingness of county administrative/staff to work with cities
- Building codes
- Farm use
- Rural road improvement
- Economic development outside of industry
- Road paving (dust/sludge)
- Quicker connection to 435
- Environmentally sensitive
- Adoption of building codes
- Improve blighted areas over populated areas
- Parks and open spaces
- P and Z needs to expand notification notice in rural-residential areas to 1 mile in all direction vs 100 ft.
- Maintain/preserve agriculture by requiring more acreage when developing
- Safe intersections
- Maintain community feel of Leavenworth County
- Improved access to I-435 and K7
- Better roads i.e. pothole repairs, resurfacing, paving gravel roads
- Better access to major highways
- Better mental health services
- Property maintenance codes
- Commercial growth
- Industries that will retain citizens – think who live here and keep this city going when I’m gone
- Mental health services
- Support existing hospitals
- Get younger citizens involved in future plans i.e. bring new ideas to the table
- Bring the water district to Golden Rd.
- Property rights
- Better north south travel options in SW county
- Building codes
- Able to buy groceries w/o driving 5 miles
- Reduce the number of gravel roads
- Roads
- YWCA or YMCA southern part of county
- Preserve rural atmosphere
- Quality, affordable internet
- Sanitary sewer plan
- County mental health facility
- Better parks and community center access
- Encourage office space development
- Clean healthy environment
- Roads/better roads
- New business
- Develop southern county
- Cost estimaters
- Manufacturing or commercial developments to create jobs
- Designated areas for industrial growth and planning
- Control urban sprawl
- Job producing industries
- Roads and sewers
- Job opportunities
- Increased tax base
- IT/Cable
- Better internet coverage
- Encourage small business development
- Encourage small farms
- Better infrastructure standards
- More paved roads in rural residential areas
- Road improvements (bridge) to eliminate detours during spring/fall flooding
- Full time fire response (vs volunteer) in rural areas
- Increase in green energy (wind and solar)
- 2nd bridge over MO River in southern county
- Replacement of Centennial Bridge
- More and decent connector to I-435
- Industry or distribution for jobs 0 tax
- Continue paving gravel roads
- County wide green energy plan
- North south major arterials through center and north county
- Commercial railroad spur
- County wide mental health plan
- Appoint Leavenworth County econ development officer/office
- County junior college instead of several institutions offering piece meal parts of advanced educational opportunities
- 4 lane highway from north to south
- Resilient development
- New 4 lane Hwy from Eisenhower / Hwy 73, East/SE across MO River Valley, new MO River Bridge connecting to MO Hwy 15
- Zoning the same on both sides of the road
- 5G!
- WiFi throughout the county and better competition
- A connecting arterial road from north to south
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pave the roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Zoning plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More employment options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinated infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Healthier food options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paved roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cable availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation plan for 5, 10, 20 year growth projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pave existing gravel roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High speed internet in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walk/bike trail systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I want the 2 city plan and zoning members residing outside of city to be chosen by county residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nice restaurants – locally owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I want county property owners to have a vote on the adoption of plan and/or annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interstate exit development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locally owned businesses, restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More parks and trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secure agriculture zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More small farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preservation of open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recreational areas, preserved open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More private sector employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Market rate multi family options for younger folks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More law enforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Access for biking and hiking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better access between cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical education center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skills crafts development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STEM development center for ALL ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More retail options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks and rec dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recreation areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connecting trail system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creating round a bouts to deter more stop lights on main corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe places to walk in nature/parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand the park at the county lake to include a walking trail completely around the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parkways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved public space maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More parks/bigger parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better maintained buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Successful local businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agriculture accommodation support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North/south roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trails and parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More paved roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low property taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forest/timber preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks/trauls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Light industry that doesn’t pollute or threaten Leavenworth County’s beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convention center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dog parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider wind farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Put state lake to use for public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hiking and biking trails through wooded areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commercial/business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More hiking/walking trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public areas that leverage the land – camping, fishing, mountain biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tech schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More trails, trails connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased safety features on main highways (24/40 and K7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to drive revenue from non-residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminate R5 zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Controlled growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retail and dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep taxes low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce traffic lights on Hwy 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial airport/pasenger in south county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not change perspective of leave as a farm and ranch community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food hub for county growers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain rural feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional high schools to maintain small school feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated sewer one, water one for entire county including cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inform rural community of plans for property prior to purchase. Residents must approve plans prior to purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planned growth but not overly difficult for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consolidation of city governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand our agriculture to include “greens” - food from greenhouses – California can’t be relied on and we shouldn’t rely on South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Processes and zoning that allow for business growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce obstacles (stoplights on Hwy 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep all quarry’s and mining away from the Kansas River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change heavy industrial zoning in floodplains to agriculture only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage equality (LGBTQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High-speed internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Texas Roadhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exhibition center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North/south transport corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Floodplain management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommend by a drawing to show how new housing and industrial areas can be integrated into county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sewer system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well defined paths of communication, gov. – citizens, citizens - gov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grocery stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An “identity” for the smaller communities – don’t turn into Lenexa or West Shawnee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low light pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Detailed plan for infrastructure, sewer system / roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More options for recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completion of way outer belt from Gardner Intermodal to I29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add Freddie’s to new roads, No McDonalds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More public parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better bridge and road to Missouri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impediments
- Gravel and dirt roads
- Lack of plan
- County zoning as currently written
- Lack of economical development to off set tax bases
- Lack of grocery stores
- Idea that industry is the only type of economic development we can have
- Leaders with personal agendas rather than community well being goals
- Utilities creating boundary issues needlessly
- Climate change
- River
- Military fort and prisons (take away some revenue, but use roads, pay no taxes, etc.)
- Internet
- Wasting money mowing road shoulder w/ old machine that landowners can mow with lawn mower
- Don't let the improvements of county be hampered by fiefdoms of the cities/towns
- Poor tax base
- Egos
- River x 2
- Bad regulations
- River, Strange Creek, Bridges, Floodplain
- Stranger Creek
- Discourage water and sewer extension and encourage developments into city limits
- Real estate interests seem to drive county decisions
- Ability to split land
- Lack of high paying jobs
- “Keep it the way it is” mentality
- Do not spent large amounts of money to pave rural roads. Paved should be paid by rural taxes not cities
- Ft. Leavenworth’s huge transient population affects housing, infrastructure, tax base, etc.
- Lacking industrial tax base

## Obstacles
- Creating urban sprawl
- County web page is terrible
- Money
- Low income and taxes from the cities of Leavenworth/Lansing and prisons
- Landscape
- Stranger Creek
- Strong opinions in county that clash very independent-minded
- Discourage housing that is not near urban areas
- County administrative/staff adverse to working with cities
- People who don't like change – people who have lived there their entire life
- Lack of forward thinking
- Public transportation
- Don’t sacrifice quality of infrastructure for quantity, example road standards
- City/county divided interests
- 12 stoplights along HW7
- Cost of infrastructure (water, sewer, roads)
- Conservative approach
- Metro access
- River crossing
- Paved roads
- Fort pays NO property or sales tax
- The needs and wants of surrounding counties block our progress of infrastructure improvements, and economic development
- Rural internet
- Small tax base
- Individual land owners
- Poor infrastructure standards
- North v south interests and competition for county resources
- Differing opinions on what is needed
- Short sighted tax policy
- Lack of high speed internet in rural areas
- Preponderance of county fund being spent in north part of county
- Housing being built in random locations
- Number of stops on 7 HWY
- Conservative based county – change is hard
- Roads/terrain
- The “we’ve always done it this way” mentality
- Unmanaged corporate growth – expansion
- Too many unpaved (gravel) roads in rural residential areas
- Good old boy network
- Lack of high speed internet in rural areas
- Conservative base of people – not forward thinking
- No communication through county
- Lack of sewer/water infrastructure

## Dislikes
- Too much commercial/industrial property in rural areas
- Allowing developers to buy parcels outside city limits in rural areas and expecting to build high density communities
- Better parks opportunities so families will settle here rather than elsewhere
- Unwillingness to embrace change
- Friction between cities and county
- Commercial within 25 feet of residential development (in county)
- Lack of infrastructure in rural developments. Awkward land use when all development follows the road sides.
- This is people thing – lots of real provincialism, inability to cooperate among entities
- Subdivisions in rural areas
- Subdivisions in county
- Incomplete business plans released (or not) to public
- Bureaucracy
- Basehor seeking to control land use with broad language agreement
- Leavenworth County Planning and Zoning notification process
- That cities have been given power to impose control over property owners outside city limits without permission of land owners
- Lack of vision
- Secret deals with developers
- History of things happening without community input
- Lack of code enforcement
- Planning and Zoning tells you a policy and then you see others not following. Inconsistent.
- County management seems to dismiss the needs of city of Leavenworth residents
- Too may water districts
- Transfer station operational direction – lost all fairness!
- Blighted and junky properties
- Lack of consideration for property owners’ rights
This document only serves as a summary and record of the 10 focus groups facilitated as part of the public engagement process for the Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan. It is important to note that the focus group information has not been integrated with findings from the Visioning Workshop (May 23, 2019), the public survey (to close on September 1, 2019), nor the Planning Charrette (October 1-3, 2019). All the public engagement events - together - will paint a more complete picture of the public's priorities for the Leavenworth County in the future.
Leavenworth County Focus Group Summary

Overview
New Boston Creative Group conducted ten focus groups in June 2019. Groups were organized into five primary topics, and all related to different aspects of population growth in the county. Each of the five topics was offered in the north (Easton) and south (Tonganoxie) part of the county. The topics were:

- Land Use/Zoning
- Infrastructure
- Agriculture
- Urban Growth
- Economic Development

Participant Demographics

- 101 participants and 54 unique participants, with 27 people attending more than one group. Four people attended all five groups in their area.
- 33 participants in the north sessions, 68 in the south.
- 64% of participants had lived in Leavenworth County for 20+ years.
- 56% of participants lived in the unincorporated areas.
- Tonganoxie was the most represented city. Cities also represented in the focus groups were: Leavenworth, Lansing, Basehor, Linwood, Easton and Kansas City.
- Attendees were 68% male and 32% female.

Report of Findings
This report will summarize topics covered in the focus groups, highlighting opinions that varied within groups or between north and south groups. The topics this report will summarize include:

- Perceptions of County Growth
- Infrastructure
- Agriculture
- Economic Development
- Land Use and Zoning
- Urban Growth Boundaries
- Other Concerns
Perceptions of County Growth

Overview

• Most groups agreed that growth was inevitable, so it needs to be controlled.

• As it’s the oldest county in the state, some people were happy to see others moving to Leavenworth County and recognizing what is great about living there.

• The most common advantage to growth mentioned was that it would potentially decrease property taxes by spreading expenses among more residents.

• Northern groups were generally concerned about how growth could contribute to the loss of agricultural land, an increase in traffic on gravel roads, and loss of the natural beauty of the county due to views being obstructed by more housing.

• More of our southern participants had lived in Leavenworth County fewer than 10 years (22%), and saw themselves as part of the growth. The northern participants were more likely to be long-time residents (79% had been residents for more than 20 years), and some had had family farms in the county for generations.

Preferred Locations for Future Development

Overall

• Within cities — 44.23%
• On the edge of existing cities — 35.26%
• Along County Road 1 — 12.18%
• Undeveloped rural areas — 4.49%
• Not sure — 2.56%
• I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 1.28%

North

• Within cities — 51.85%
• On the edge of existing cities — 33.33%
• Along County Road 1 — 11.11%
• Undeveloped rural areas — 1.85%
• Not sure — 0%
• I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 1.85%
South

- Within cities — 40.20%
- On the edge of existing cities — 36.27%
- Along County Road 1 — 12.75%
- Undeveloped rural areas — 5.88%
- Not sure — 3.92%
- I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0.98%

Discussion

- The general consensus seemed to be that there is the most potential for growth within existing cities like Leavenworth, where density could be increased and older buildings could be renovated and repurposed. Many participants saw a lot of potential in Downtown Leavenworth for new businesses to open and more housing to be built.

- After that would come growth on the edge of existing cities; however, some people were against that as well, believing the sole focus should be within the existing cities.

- Commercial growth should be limited to where it’s being specifically targeted and where it makes sense, such as along County Road 1. Many people worried that the rural areas cannot handle the traffic and infrastructure needs that come with commercial locating out in those areas.

- As far as growth out in the rural areas, people seemed to understand that one of the ways in which Leavenworth County is growing is through land being split up into 2.5- or 5-acre lots, where people from the city are moving to enjoy a rural atmosphere and scenic countryside. Infrastructure seemed to be the main issue participants had with new growth being located in rural areas. They felt cities are already prepared to handle these needs. Paved roads, sewers, fire protection, water lines, increased traffic, etc., all disrupt rural life and can cause an increase in taxes.
Infrastructure

Policies to Manage Growth

Participants unanimously felt that the county should adopt policies to encourage residential growth in areas where infrastructure and services currently exist or are planned for.

Gravel Roads

- There is a general feeling, especially in the north, that gravel roads are inevitable and just part of the experience of living in a rural area.

- Traffic load should be the determining factor in whether a gravel road is paved.

- Some people also felt that school bus routes should be paved.

- As far as who should pay for road improvement, most felt the expense should be paid through a combination of developers’ fees and the property taxes of the owners who would benefit from the improved road.

North-South Connections

- The creation of more north-south connections in the county would be great, but it’s not a high priority.

- Many people have the perception that there have been several attempts to create more north-south connections through the county that have either failed or run into roadblocks.

- Many mentioned they would like to see these types of connections being planned for today so that in the future — when funding is available and the need is justified — it will be easier to put a new road in.

- It seemed that widening the roads that currently exist is more of a priority due to safety concerns (see Other Concerns).
Fire Protection

- Requiring residential subdivisions to have fire hydrants and adequate fire protection in Leavenworth County is a unanimous “yes”; however, participants understand that most rural areas don’t have access to the right size of water lines, meaning this would be a substantial cost.

- Participants felt the developers should take on that cost.

- However, several people suggested that government-provided fire protection is just one of those things you may have to sacrifice to live out in the county, where response times are longer and many firefighters are volunteers.

Countywide Sewer Program

- Participants saw the value of a countywide sewer program, as long as future density supports it.

- The main concerns were whether the cities should be worrying about extending sewers to their urban growth districts, and whether a countywide sewer program would increase taxes. Many rural participants have septic systems that they are happy with. Others feel that septic is outdated and a sewer program would be better.

Rural Internet Services

- Most participants across all groups would strongly support Leavenworth County exploring ways to incentivize internet companies to provide more or faster internet services out in the unincorporated areas.

- However, some questioned whether this was an appropriate task for county workers, rather than relying on private enterprise to meet demands.

- There was a desire to see more competition among internet service providers in the county.

- Several people mentioned that they work from home on their computers, or would if they had better internet speeds.
• Farmers acknowledged that there is agricultural technology they are unable to take advantage of without internet access in their areas.

**Hiking, Biking and Equestrian Trails**

• Overall, participants agreed county-built trails “would be nice,” but aren’t a priority.

• Most felt that trails should be the cities’ responsibility, or paid for by some kind of outside funding like a private developer or a grant, not with county tax dollars.

• There was concern about who would pay for maintenance after trails are created.

• Northern groups and some of the people who live in the unincorporated areas were concerned that trails would bring more people to the edge of their property, which could bring security issues.

• Some were intrigued by the idea of creating trails out of abandoned railroad tracks, if that is possible.

• The safety concern of bikers riding on roads and highways came up at almost every group. Participants felt that creating wider roads with bike lanes or wider shoulders was a better solution than creating separate trails for them.

**Parks and Recreation Department**

• Southern participants all felt that more parks would be great, but may be more of a city function than the county.

• Northern participants were less open to a parks department due to concerns about where the parkland would come from and the added cost to the county to create a parks department.

• Northerners also felt that the county’s population had not yet grown to a level that county parks were necessary in addition to the parks the cities already have.

• As to how a parks department could be funded, answers were split among all groups between general fund, countywide sales tax, developer fees or a combination of sources. User fees, campground fees, or club sports teams that would use the parks were also suggested possible revenue streams.
Rural Transit Services

• None of the groups saw a need for rural transit services.

Mental Health Services

• The majority of participants agreed that increasing access to mental health services in the county is a need. While some think the county should take the lead in exploring more services, others felt this should be the responsibility of schools, hospitals, the county health department or Fort Leavenworth.

STEM Education

• For youth, all groups felt the schools are already doing an adequate job of STEM education.

• For adults, groups brought up concerns about whether there are enough technical college programs or community college programs for trades. But overall, it wasn’t considered the county’s responsibility, but a role for educational organizations.

Community Centers

• Majority felt there are already adequate community centers in the cities, and that most of the facilities that already exist are underutilized.

• Northerners felt money could be better spent improving existing centers, and southerners felt that in areas where community centers do not exist, libraries, churches and other spaces have already filled that role/need.
**Agriculture**

**Importance of Preserving Farmland**

- Preserving land for agriculture was of high importance to all groups.
- There were no specific areas they would like to see preserved.

**Pushing Development Towards Cities**

- Participants were unanimously in favor of the county adopting policies that push the majority of new development towards cities to preserve large swaths of farmland.
- Besides preservation of farmland, participants felt it just makes more sense to build near existing city-provided infrastructure and other services.
- Keeping growth near cities seemed like the unanimous, logical answer.

**Minimum Agriculture Zoning District**

- Most people did not support a minimum 20-acre zoning district in rural areas to protect farmland.
- The cost of a 20-acre parcel of land is high, which limits who can build out in the county.
- Many people brought up the scenario of when a farmer wants to split up their land among their children. Nearly all participants who farmed did not want the government to be able to tell them how to split up their property, because in some cases they want to give land to a child for a personal residence, and in others they want to give them land to farm. People didn’t like being required to keep a parcel at a five-acre minimum because it forced their child to have to maintain more land than they want and could result in land being wasted (not farmed) in the future.
- The southern group agreed that there should be a minimum, but 20 is too large. A minimum of 5 acres, which is the current minimum, was suggested.
Regulating Minimum Size of Agricultural Parcels

- It was difficult for groups to come to a conclusion as to whether the county should regulate the minimum size of agricultural parcels of land.

- Most people did not want to see agricultural land subdivided into many smaller pieces, but also felt that it is inevitable.

- Forty acres, the current agricultural land size, was seen as a lot of land and agriculture can happen on much smaller pieces of land. No one wanted to discourage these types of small-scale agricultural activities by requiring a minimum size.

Agritourism

- When asked whether the county should explore new possible agriculture assets that could be marketed to bring in agritourism dollars to the county, both groups turned to discussing some of the existing private agritourism activities already being done in the county. Several of the southerners felt the county needed to have some kind of regulation of these businesses, due to the road traffic they generate.

- Most people seemed to think that the county shouldn’t hinder agritourism, but no one really advocated the county actively developing and promoting new agritourism opportunities.

Economic Development

Reaching the County’s Potential

- All participants felt the county was not growing to meet its potential.

- Participants see Leavenworth County as a “bedroom community,” which they believe is hindering a lot of potential business growth.

- However, many people don’t want to lose the rural and “small-town” feel of Leavenworth County, either.

- There is a worry that Leavenworth’s reputation for being anti-business is also hindering economic development.
Satisfaction with Economic Development Efforts

- In the north, people are dissatisfied with economic development efforts. They felt the taxpayers have funded multiple studies — such as the airport study — that ended up going nowhere. They worry their tax dollars are not being used efficiently for this purpose. One proposed solution was that economic development should be separate from the county, to avoid any political bias affecting efforts.

- In the south, there was dissatisfaction with the efforts of LCDC. Most people feel they are not including the public in their efforts and, like the north, are not seeing results they would expect for the time and money that has been put into it. The cities and the county should be working together for economic development purposes.

Desire for More County Involvement

- The northern group does not think the county should be more actively involved in economic development. Their reasons for objecting to more involvement were a concern that it would cost too much but produce little, and that free enterprise should be allowed to control what happens in the county.

- Alternatively, the southern group thinks the county needs to be much more involved in economic development, particularly with regard to representing the rural areas.

Sales Tax Program for Retention, Expansion and Recruitment of Businesses

People would rather see a sales tax than an increase on their property taxes. However, there was concern the county doesn’t have the tax base or enough retail business to generate adequate funds through sales tax. They were undecided as to whether this type of program would be useful.

Tax Abatements or Incentives for Private Companies

- Answers were mixed as to whether the county should offer tax abatements or cash incentives to private companies in order to recruit them to locate in Leavenworth County.
• Some felt these incentives would be unfair to existing businesses and that trying to create something like Legends in Leavenworth County would be pointless because people would still go to Legends to shop.

• Both groups used Legends as an example of something positive, and the southern group felt that Power and Light in Kansas City had been a great way to revitalize the downtown area through a TIF district. Both groups would be in favor of something like that happening in Leavenworth County.

Types of New Development That Should Be Pursued

• Participants would like economic development efforts to pursue a mix of development types, including commercial, industrial and real estate. They would like to encourage light industry that creates living wage jobs, so that people can afford to buy houses and spend money in the county.

• Focusing on clean or “green” industries was brought up as a shared value of county residents.

• Participants would also like to see shopping and entertainment, particularly chain businesses such as a Target or Chipotle, as well as businesses that encourage tourism. However, they understand that retail follows rooftops, and that the county needs more primary industries and housing first.

Land Use and Zoning

Building Codes in the County

• Almost all participants felt a uniform building code in the county for new structures would be beneficial for safety and aesthetic reasons. Most were surprised that these codes did not already exist.

• Participants with farms would like to be able to build small buildings such as chicken coops without adhering to a strict set of codes, so they were in favor as long as the codes only applied to residential structures.

• When it comes to paying for a building code program, the southern groups overwhelmingly favored a combination of property owner and the county.
• The northern group mentioned that the property owner or the builder/developer should have to pay for it.

**Cities Enforcing Building Codes in the Urban Growth District**

• The southern group unanimously felt that if something is not part of a city, it should not have to obey city codes.

• The northern group was split. Some felt that if the buildings are in the urban growth district, then it makes sense to go along with the city. Others felt that allowing this would be too much government interference, and that the state designates the urban growth boundary and the state does not have a policy about enforcing codes within that boundary.

**Requiring Residential Subdivisions to Meet City Design Standards**

• Northern participants thought that the urban growth district will be part of the city soon enough, so it only makes sense to require them to meet the city’s design standards.

• However, some people, especially in the southern group, felt that since residences in the urban growth boundary are technically in the county, those people would have no representation in the city government and therefore should not have to adhere to city regulations. The southern group was not in favor of enacting this requirement.

**Special Use Permits**

• Many participants felt that the special use permits were just a way for businesses to avoid zoning regulations, which interferes with planned growth.

• They felt that if there is a business that does not fit the zoning regulations in an area, there needs to be an extensive process to decide whether they are allowed a special use permit, and that right now, some businesses that have been allowed to operate under special use permits are doing so without enough consideration going into the decision.

• Some people were in favor of doing away with special use permits altogether.
Urban Growth Boundaries

Encouraging Residential Growth in Planned Subdivisions

- Participants felt that residential growth needed to be planned, but that the county shouldn’t necessarily be encouraging it.
- Most participants hoped that these planned subdivisions would be nearer to existing cities, and not necessarily out in the county.

Control Where New Development Occurs

Participants felt that the county should control where growth occurs, so that new growth is planned with the future of the county in mind. This includes working with cities to create a plan that fulfills both the county’s and the cities’ visions for the future.

Control What Type of New Development Occurs

In regard to unincorporated areas, all participants agreed that the county should control what type of new development occurs, and that this should be done through zoning.

Promote Denser Development in Urban Growth Management Areas

Participants were in favor of denser development as long as it isn’t “out in the county” where things like apartment complexes don’t make sense. They agree there is a need for multi-family residences.

Actively Preserving Nature Areas

- Preserving nature areas was extremely important to all participants, if it is done in the right way.
- Concerns included where the preserved land would come from, whether the preserved land would be taken from landowners, and whether there are any specific areas worth preserving.
• Some people mentioned that residents are choosing not to develop in areas in the floodplain anyway, so nature “preserves itself.”

• Participants agreed that Leavenworth County is beautiful and they prioritize keeping the land as it is as much as possible.

Other Concerns

Road Safety

Roads and road safety came up in several focus groups. One concern was that paving narrow, rural roads leads to farmers and their equipment sharing the road with people who drive above the speed limit. They would like to see strategies that help minimize the risk of accidents.

Similarly, people are biking on the narrow roads with little or no shoulder, such as Tonganoxie Road, because there are no other places for them to bike in the county. This worries a lot of drivers in the county and many people suggested widening the roads to add a much wider shoulder for bikers to use.

Cul-de-sacs

Many participants were frustrated with the increase of cul-de-sacs as part of residential subdivisions. More and more neighborhoods are being created without through streets, which leads to unplanned, winding roads. They would like to see a plan created that guides developers as to what kind of roads they can build and where through streets need to be placed.

Transparency

Many people felt that there has been a lack of transparency from the county government in the past, which they believe has caused a lot of the issues, such as with the proposed Tyson facility. They felt that if the county had involved more residents in the planning process, conflicts could have been avoided. Several people mentioned feeling the focus groups were a good way to include them in the process.
Agriculture Focus Group North
Participants: 8

- Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?
  - I’m not impressed with having more growth, but I’m an old fart.
  - I think the county should be divided in half. I think the north and south county are completely different entities.
  - I don’t like the idea that... we have a farm that’s been here since 1882 and when we first married there were five houses on the road and now there’s 16 of them. When something happened to one of ours, we couldn’t build again. When one house is on an acre of ground, it doesn’t meet the standards of today. I was told if the house is burned down, it can’t be rebuilt. At one point in time, they put a grandfather clause in but it’s been kicked out.
  - Are you sure? I was commissioner when we adopted that because my house is on one acre also...
  - I think it boils down to future commissions cannot be tied to former commissions’ decisions.
  - Did they take that out?
  - Jeff Joseph: You can still get a variance.
  - So it’s not guaranteed.
  - I’m mixed on it. I don’t want to be squeezed out. All of the sudden we’ve got all this traffic on our road that is narrow, dusty and that’s it.
  - Historically, Leavenworth County has had uncontrolled growth; the rules change every day. So I think everybody’s seen that. I’m not excited about the variance of rules.
  - Yes and no. As far as taxes, yes, but I want my nice view of my property.
  - I’m also mixed on that. Karen was right, some of the rules we make should not apply on the north end of the county. When you get west of Stranger Creek, nobody’s building out there. The growth ought to be in the cities.
Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.

- Within cities — 8
- On the edge of existing cities — 5
- Undeveloped rural areas — 0
- Along County Road 1 — 1
- Not sure — 0
- I don't want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0

Why did you answer the way you did?

- The cities are already prepared with infrastructure for more people.

- I think my biggest problem is when people move to the country, they want to bring their city ways with it and push them off onto the country folks. They really want to live in cities but they don't want neighbors. If you're in any type of agriculture, they'll move near you and then want to push you out because they don't like it. Stay in town!

- We had a dairy and some people moved out and built a big fancy new home and they went in and tried to shut us down because they didn't like the odor. But they had horses. The horses were fine but they didn't want the cows.

- Horses don't smell!

- I want to ask a question: are we talking about growth in houses or growth in industry?

- FACILITATOR: Any new development, commercial, residential, and so on.

- To me the growth ought to be along County Road 1 south of Tonganoxie, the intersection to the turnpike.

- The one you voted on.

- To me there should never be any exits off of that one. You have the road to go off but there should never be houses directly off that road. The only time you can get off the road is at crossroads.
We’re talking about our $20 million road? The one that should have changed the zoning to commercial before it was built. You wouldn’t have the problems. Now they have the road and they won’t change zoning.

The counties were not planned to have sewers and all the infrastructure they want. They need to stay in town.

But we do want high-speed internet...

**FACILITATOR: We’ll get to that.**

We want the best of all worlds, don’t we?

The reality is, most of the cities should focus on inner growth, multi-residential kind of concepts. They don’t focus on that, they’re not inviting concepts there, there’s no inviting business there. There’s no reason Delaware downtown couldn’t be like Mass Street in Lawrence. Continuing to build strip malls that’ll be empty and can’t get filled—it doesn’t work.

Do you favor a policy that pushes the majority of new development towards our cities and preserves farmlands? Why or why not?

- Yes, because they can handle the infrastructure.
- Yes.
- Out here we make food for people and if that’s all gone...there’s a drought out west, what are they going to do?
- If they want town, they should be there.
- Eventually there won’t be a place to raise food!

Should the county adopt policies to encourage residential growth in areas where infrastructure and services currently exist or are planned for?

- Yes [unanimous]

Should the county regulate the minimum size of rural agriculture parcels of land?

- No.
- To build a house?
- I think agriculture could be even an acre.
Yes, they have to regulate it, someone might try to put a house on a 15,000 square foot lot.

JJ: Now the minimum is 5 acres, so do you support 10 acre, 20 acre, etc. Not zoned agriculture. Do you want people to come in and split off 2.5-acre lots and 5-acre lots? Would you like the county to have a minimum of 10 or 20 acres?

Then you have to take the agriculture out of it.

Krystal Voth: Agriculture can happen regardless of size.

Rural residential parcels of land.

2 acres.

You think 2 acres should be minimum?

Because that’s enough for a septic tank, otherwise you get people with 10-acre pieces and they try to put six houses on it.

But they said minimum.

What’s the smallest we should allow?

I think if it’s in proximity of municipalities and they can support the infrastructure....

You couldn’t have a ton of houses on 2-acre lots on a gravel road.

Then you’d have to pave it.

If it were 40 acres, there wouldn’t be near as many of them.

Yes, we need regulations.

I would agree.

FACILITATOR: How small should be the minimum?

I want 40 acres.

Question: in 1987 wasn’t there a law that said 38.5, anything below that doesn’t fall under the regulations?

FACILITATOR: The issue is how much should we allow people to subdivide down to.

Some people that have large farms could divide it down and create a subdivision of tons of houses.
It’s the reality we face where we live.

I think it’s proximity to municipality.

I don’t have a problem with 2 or 2.5 acres if there’s sewer or it’s paved road. But if not, then 5 acres. I used to farm a lot of these grounds that the 5-acre tracts become trash dumps.

Now the county has regulations as far as stipulations for the frontage, for as how far back, so we don’t have the long spaghetti strips. I think that’s what you’re referring to, where the back grows up.

That’s why they love to have those 10 acres, but what do they do with it?

To me, it’s a waste of ground because with 10 acres they’re not going to raise a whole lot of stuff.

Unless they do greenhouses. A lot of people have those. But you’re not going to have a big tractor or a big farm.

I kind of go back to, I remember when things were looked at on a more individual status and I liked that as far as family splits and things like that. Sometimes I think there should still be that individual look at a property.

When we split off a piece for my son to build a home it had to be 5 acres, he didn’t want 5 acres, but that’s what it was in our area. He left it in our pasture. He didn’t want to mow it and keep it up. And I don’t see... they tell you that you have to do 5 acres when they didn’t want 5 acres. Right?

Better for pasture than for meat.

5 acres is too much for a wife to have to mow.

Depends on how big a mower you buy her!

How important is it to you for the county to actively preserve nature areas such as woodlands, streams, lakes, and scenic views?

Zero.

How important is it?

If they want you to do A, B, C and they say if you don’t do it they’ll drain your lake, and if they have money for other projects, they should offer assistance instead of telling you to do it or don’t.
You mean county-owned properties? Or personal property that people own that the county has a right to say what we can do with it?

JJ: It’s the floodplain areas and do you want to see development within those areas? Do you want to see the trees destroyed?

Flood plains, you can’t do anything there anyway.

JJ: Correct, but there are some areas they could.

If they’re owned by people, that’s their problem, but if it’s owned by the county, they should preserve it.

JJ: But the county doesn’t own any land.

Nature areas are beautiful here.

Don’t spray them, don’t kill all the bees but let the farmers do what they have to do to keep their land.

It’s one of the questions of... since the county doesn’t own the land we’re discussing, and the question is can the county regulate your property? And that’s just more government influence.

FACILITATOR: These ideas came from the visioning event. We’re just trying to get more information about everyone’s priorities.

It sounds to me like whoever brought this up, they moved out in the county but their neighbor has trees that they don’t want someone else to build land on. They don’t want the area next to them developed.

It’s almost a situation of taking by the government.

Do you think the county should take the lead in exploring new possible agriculture assets that could be marketed to bring in agritourism dollars into the county?

You talking about hemp?

FACILITATOR: It can be wineries, orchards, pumpkin patches, things that get people to spend money in the county and enjoy, attractions, etc.

I mentioned that yesterday for infrastructure about having the beautiful business park that’s empty to be a Wild West town. Indoor playground and so on. That’s basically in the city, not out here. But those are my thoughts.

Having a campground resort area on your property. Does that count?
- FACILITATOR: One example near here is a lavender farm.

- Like the sunflower patch?

- FACILITATOR: Yes, should the county help develop those things? Agritourism is a big booming part of the state economy.

- The county should not be putting a hindrance on it. I don’t know who is developing it.

- FACILITATOR: Do we think the county should play a role?

- Are they gonna charge? Do they have some kind of income? Like at the sunflowers, I know they have a place for donations and the traffic was a huge problem and that’s part of our tax money to have cops there regulating traffic.

- In the relevance of a county that pays dollars to different organizations to pull in business, it should be part of those organizations’ focus. Besides the John Deere plant, etc., a lot of those groups, I don’t see much value in them, they seem to focus on more of traditional business vs. agricultural business so they should help that process, if that makes sense.

- FACILITATOR: I think there are ways the government could help support that.

- **How important is it to you for the county to preserve land for agriculture rather than commercial or residential development?**

  - Very important.

  - I don’t think you’ll get much argument from this group.

  - When I heard about this focus group, I said, “Hey, we need to make sure farmers say what they have to say,” so I’m glad they are here.

  - Eventually we’re gonna die and when we die, it’s gonna get subdivided. It’s inevitable.

- **Should the county prioritize/invest in hiking, hiking and equestrian trails and other forms of active transportation infrastructure?**

  - Security would be a problem if you had trails. They're having problems in other counties with security and people being attacked on these trails.

  - No, that’s not a county thing. The county was set up for protection, roads, court system, safety. You keep wanting to get the county involved in everything that the county shouldn’t do.
We’re all saying keep your hands off!

That goes back to your question before that, if a landowner wants to do trails and they come to the county, then at that point the county would get involved, but the county shouldn’t try to condemn the land and put in a trail.

There was that one farm outside of Tonganoxie, they built a lot of houses and that’s ideal for all those people who want horses. If they want horses, they live out there and there’s a horse trail all around the place.

FACILITATOR: People have talked about old railroad beds that have been converted. Trails are big in a lot of areas to improve quality of life.

We don’t have any railroad beds here.

It all depends.

It involves parking lots and whether they want...when I read the back page of the paper, the itty bitty stuff that’s hard to understand, they talk about penalties people have to pay if they’ve violated parking. To me it looks more like a penalty for the people that want to have a business.

It goes back to liability. It just depends on how it’s written.

- **Should Leavenworth County explore ways to incentivize internet companies to provide rural internet services? Why?**

  Internet? What’s that? We don’t have it out where we’re at.

  It’s available through the cell phones so if you hook up to the cell phone you can get internet.

  Not at the speeds that is required to operate that kind of equipment.

  Some of those don’t even pick up. We have dead zones on our road.

  FACILITATOR: So should the county play an active role in options?

  I think that would be great.

  Isn’t that a state issue?

  Do you want that tower on your property?

  That should be an individual thing if you choose it.
The reality goes back to development anyway, those companies aren’t going to come here if people aren’t populating here because they won’t make money. It’s a catch-22.

The other thing about these questions — you heard the other day — it’s kind of like only having one half of the equation. But you could ask, would it be worth it to have Internet to cost the county if it were a dollar figure, or if it meant your sales tax would go up? Yes, we want internet, but what’s the cost?

FACILITATOR: We won’t know the cost until the county looks at options.

They should have done it before hand.

FACILITATOR: But the question is — do we want the county to do that?

That’s not their responsibility, that’s the free market.

I agree.

What other concerns do you have regarding agriculture lands in the unincorporated areas of the county?

Ways to preserve it. The county needs to actively try to preserve the agriculture of the county, not develop it.

I think the state statute maintains that, but everyone wants to push against the state statute. Agriculture is exempt, and we can put up a building with little regulation. The state of Kansas has already protected that. The county doesn’t need to influence the state or to go against that.

So if you go against 40 acres adjoining another farm, and you want to put a barn on it, I’ve heard people are not allowed that. If there isn’t a rural dwelling on that property, they can’t have a barn.

That depends on whether someone is agriculturally involved or someone who just wants to build a building who possibly still lives in town just to have some place to put a building on. But if it has a purpose then he should be able to do that. But if someone wants a place to put his boat, RV, or just some place he wants to move into on weekends…

If I can go down another rabbit trail…so the county, with their dust abatement and these new policies with very little road construction and what not. All of the sudden, we’ll chip and seal a road with very little consideration of hills. The reality is there’s still agriculture on those highways bringing trucks but now they’re on a race. Now we have a component of a safety issue. Didn’t do the hills, or widen the shoulders, and now someone’s taking a tractor down
and somebody lives in a subdivision down the street and all of the sudden an 18-year-old kid is driving on what used to be a gravel road, is now doing 50. Possibly gonna take his life and possibly take the agricultural community with them. We adopt things without thinking those things through. I don't think that was a great decision when it comes to the agricultural community.

- As well as the bicycles.
- You can fly over the hill.
- FACILITATOR: That’s why we were talking about trails.
- But to have trails you have to invade people’s property.
- We have trespassing problems as it is.
- In the effort to curb our constituents, our voting population who moved out here on gravel road and has complained to commissioners and now the only thing they can do is pave in place. The reality is they’ve adopted new policies, a lot of those roads are still agricultural, it’s a lot of agricultural activity that happens on that road.
- You’ve got Missouri roads where you pave narrow ones and people crash.
- In October when someone has a tractor doing 25 and someone else going 50, there’s no question what’s going to happen.
- I was concerned about the honeybee on behalf of people who aren’t here tonight because their bees are dying. If the county would tell people where they’re gonna spray. If they’re spraying on the road right in front of the house where the honeybee people live. It’s upsetting. We see the evidence all along the roads the damage they’ve done. Spraying should be looked at for those people.
- Where are they spraying? They haven’t sprayed at my area.
- They have some kind of herbicide on the roads and destroyed beehives. That was one of the things that goes with natural beauty, but also bees are important for economic things.
- I want to ask everyone how they feel about fracking? It could be an ecological consequence for your cows. Does anyone care? There was fracking in Tonganoxie. I’m interested in the farmers who are here, if you wanted to voice your opinion on that. Is that going to make the water table go down for your neighbors?
Most cattle are watered out of ponds or out of creeks and I don’t think fracking would involve either one of them since most of them have rural water, wells are going by the wayside. I know there are some areas where people don’t have rural water in other areas of the country but not around here.

That was a public notice in the paper. How many subscribe to the paper? Only a few.

That reminds me. I was on the county website and I can’t find a place to sign up for emails. That would be a bit easier for the public.

Thank you. You got me motivated to check the county budget so I printed it off. Some work needs to be done to make that comprehensible or more transparent to voters in the county. One example is the amount spent on contracts by the commission. I wanna say it went to $130,000. So, what’s that about? What are the commodities for the county commission?
Economic Development Focus Group North
Participants: 5

• *FACILITATOR: Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?*

  o I’m an economic developer so I’m super excited.

  o I’m generally neutral, I think. We like being in the country and having our nearest neighbor be 700 feet away. I’m not particularly enthusiastic about it, but I think if it stays down in your area, I’m happy with that.

  o I am kind of happy because I know what we pay in taxes and now we can share because there are more people to help pay for everything. Otherwise I like where I live.

  o I like the growth, I moved out to the county because I didn’t want neighbors next to me. I like the idea of the taxes being spread more evenly and the opportunity for development and getting more services to the county.

• *Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.*

  o Within cities — 5
  o On the edge of existing cities — 1
  o Undeveloped rural areas — 0
  o Along County Road 1 — 2
  o Not sure — 0
  o I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 1

• *Why did you answer the way you did?*

  o The reason we moved, we liked it as it was in 2007 when we built here. Population was about 40,000. If I’d wanted to live in Johnson County, we would have moved to Johnson County. So I’m not particularly enthusiastic about a lot of growth. I don’t want to become Johnson County.

  o I can understand, I live out in the county and of course I want to keep the scenery, peace and quiet, and lack of regulation out there, I love it. But I also want to see the taxes be spread, I want to see more services and resources that come with growth.

  o I’d like to see growth within the city as far as maintenance. I moved away when I graduated high school, we had two movie theaters, shopping, all these wonderful
things. And now it’s abandoned houses, homelessness, parks not kept as they should be. Specifically the City of Leavenworth.

- I’d love to see growth in both. I like that we have a green dinosaur at the gas station now. I feel sorry for the people who live in small towns. I just don’t want a huge oil refinery here.

Do you feel the county is growing to its potential? Why or why not?

- I personally haven’t seen a whole lot of growth. I’ve seen more decline than I’ve seen growth.

- No it’s not. Well, I think Leavenworth County is getting the stigma that we’re just anti-business anymore. In 1984, I went through the Vo-tech program to do welding to work at the shipyard. It fell through when the economy declined in the late 80s. We lost some of those trade school-type businesses in the county and we haven’t regained them. I always say the killer of downtown was when they abandoned the railroad tracks. There were a lot of businesses depending on the railroad industry. I always look up in Atchison County, if it weren’t for the railroad industry, Atchison would die. You look at all the growth in Gardner, all because of that gigantic railroad they have. They can’t even keep up with the infrastructure. I heard that plant wanted to come to Leavenworth and that didn’t happen. I’m hoping for light industrial, light business. We need more than just a mom and pop shop that employs more than five people.

- I totally agree. We need primary employers.

- Isn’t there... is there any study that says it’s 15% less cost of living in Leavenworth County than Johnson County?

- I do know that we have a higher average wage, but because of government jobs. I do agree with you on the railroad. I see a lot of the requests through information come through our company and we can’t compete for a lot of railroad projects because of railroad costs. That does keep us from growing. Also Highway 7 and the amount of stoplights, that’s a huge barrier for logistics. The amount of time it takes is a real time suck, which is hard for manufacturing companies. Up until recently there was a lack of product to sell to people, but now we’ve got two new business parks. There’s also a lack of big buildings, generally we’re finding companies want over 50 thousand square feet.

- I’m the guy that’s like, “If they can do it within existing city limits, good.” There’s plenty of other places that are heavily industrialized within communities a certain distance of the county as opposed to going out into rural areas.
There are no farmers here in this group. The farmers would like to be able to have their land. This land is beautiful.

**Are you happy with the way economic development efforts are managed in the county currently? Why or why not?**

- I kinda believe that you have to have that independent from the county because it protects politicians. I know there was that big fight about the industrial park and privacy and I understand that because when companies start looking and investing and you get a whistle blower, I think sometimes keeping the politics out of it keeps it neutral. They only have one focus and that is to go find businesses and you're not playing favorites.

- I think they do too many studies and we pay for them, I think they should have us vote first. Airport was a big one. They didn't care until we produced the votes. They would have saved $120,000.

- I'm very dissatisfied. I think it's probably almost audit-worthy, it seems like, since we've been here since 2007. I think there's been some kind of development off of interchanges west of Tonganoxie, that we'd have development down there, there's been the airport study that they paid $120,000 for just to study it. There's the Eisenhower Industrial Park, and probably others, and we're paying a lot of money for studies and consulting and all that. Even if it was for development, it doesn't seem like there's much to show for it. We got money to pay for all these studies but the bridge is going to be out for minimum two years.

**Do you think the county should be more actively involved in economic development?**

- No. I don't think we're at the level where the county can get involved. I don't think they could get the results as easily. If the county's going to say they will do it in house, it's going to cost a lot to try to procure that.

- No, I think we should let the free enterprise system work. If the county government keeps the taxes low here, if the education system produces qualified graduates in in-demand fields, generally business will come. There may be issues that might prohibit it, but again I think the return on investment of paying people full time to recruit businesses is not enough. The businesses should already have people on their staff doing that. We should make the county more attractive for natural reasons.

**What type of new development should be pursued for Leavenworth County?**

- More shopping and entertainment. Because I have two small kids, if we want to do something fun I take them to Kansas City. Trails, lakes, anywhere by Leavenworth County it seems like. I love the mom and pop stores, but that's, I
mean, you can only do that so many times before the kids don’t want to anymore. Instead of putting the burden for all of this on the taxpayers, I’d like to see actual retail sales tax from businesses that people actually want to come to. I’d love a Target or a Chipotle.

• I would have to say that those are wonderful but they’ll come if we have more primary business, more basic industries which will provide the ability to have more of those. Retail will follow.

• Retail follows rooftops, rooftops follow business.

• Take a business park that sits empty and make an indoor playground so that when it’s hot we can still play, they could get food around there. I think an international market that comes here, they would have something to do. We’ve got great businesses in town. My dream would be that. My other dream would be a wild-west town, you could take that entire business park and turn it into ancient Leavenworth. Ponies, horses, rodeos. We just do it once a year in Tonganoxie and it’s a blast. Plus the restaurants.

• Tourism. I think is still under the primary basic industries, but I don’t know if that would generate the revenue when we’ve already put $10 million into that park. There are still some that could be non-invasive or smelly, like light industrial.

• I would like to see if there’s development of reopening or facilitating all the businesses in downtown Leavenworth. There’s all those businesses that are empty. I think we disadvantage downtown businesses by giving big box stores tax breaks.

• Is there any study that shows that we have the population to sustain light industry?

• It’s called a labor base study and the last one we had was done in 2015 so it’s time to do that again. They feel like we can handle it. Like you said, manufacturing companies have site selectors who go in and look for places and that’s one of the things that they’ll do.

• Would you be open to a county-wide sales tax program that focuses on retention, expansion and recruitment of new businesses to the county?

• I would much rather have that than a property tax increase, so yes.

• That’s kind of a tough question.

• It’s already in place.
- Aren't we already maxed out on our tax?
- Our tax in Leavenworth is almost as high as anywhere in Johnson County.
- Is there a roof on sales tax?
- Jeff Joseph: I think our sales tax is higher because we don’t have commercial. Johnson County has lower taxes because they have a lot more businesses.
- I just don’t know. Sales tax works if you have a lot of retail, but we don’t.
- I’m an emphatic no.

What are your feelings about tax abatements or cash incentives to private companies in order to recruit them to locate in Leavenworth County?
- I understand how it works, my only concern is that’s what screwed Lansing up, they signed that special contract where Lowe’s was supposed to go and they can’t get out of it. Now you’ve got prime real estate sitting there vacant. I understand offering like a 10-year or 8-year, but at the same time but you give that developer so many years to produce it. I know that’s what Basehor did on the grocery store but they gambled too hard on that tax abatement. It was 10 years too early. You really have to look at it if the jobs are there.
- No, it’s a basic fairness issue for existing businesses.
- I have mixed feelings. My parents both owned their own personal small businesses and I’ll be taking over those when they are gone. Part of me is no but part is yes. Again I know if I wanted to live in Johnson County I would live in Johnson County. But I also don’t want to have to drive so far to go to the one grocery store in town, Dillon’s. I want options.
- At least it’s not Country Mart, but it was better than nothing.
- It would be nice — I feel like a broken record — when I was a high school this city was booming and now there’s nothing to do in town. How much worse can it get? I’d like to see development on the north side.
- Unfortunately, tax abatements are what everybody offers so if we don’t, we have to be competitive.
- I’m for it if it brings Target and Chipotle.
- I’ll ask, you know, with our current culture and lifestyle, given the amount of shopping that’s at Legends on one side and Zona Rosa on the other side, if there was more in Leavenworth County would people still not choose to drive to those
areas? We’ll never get as much as Zona Rosa.

- There’s so many county residents like from Atchison and Winchester they can go to Lawrence or Topeka. So I don’t know, I think if we did have the bigger retail stores, people would come here instead of going. I don’t like to drive half an hour to Zona Rosa.

- I think we’d at least capture the money that’s leaving our county.

- Should Leavenworth County explore ways to incentivize internet companies to provide rural internet services? Why?

  - Yes, I think, coming from my husband who works 1.5 hours away, he could work from home but can’t. Even with satellite internet, it’s extremely slow and for the work that he does it’s just not fast enough to handle that. I know personally a lot of moms that run business out of their home, that blast stuff online and the internet, and I know one lady pays $600 a month because if one is out she has the other. As a rule we can work from home, but we don’t want to feel completely isolated. We can still interact with the rest of the world.

  - I found a frustration when I was going to school, I was doing some classes online and I lived out in the county and I had that same problem. That’s not to speak of the technology that could help agriculture.

  - We always talk about having infrastructure, sewers, water, gas, is the internet becoming almost as standard as the infrastructure?

  - Like another utility.

  - It absolutely is. That’s one of the first things they want to know about the business parks. They don’t even look if they don’t have certain internet specifications.

  - On the internet, believe it or not, I think that’s one that oughta be quantified. If the dollars are right and it doesn’t mean everyone’s taxes would increase.

  - FACILITATOR: The question is just should the county explore ways.

  - It depends on what the dollars and cents are.

- Should the county prioritize/invest in hiking, biking and equestrian trails and other forms of active transportation infrastructure?

  - I don’t have an issue as long as there’s grant money to do it. Leavenworth is, I don’t want to use the term retirement community, we’re the baby boomer
generation. You go to Douglas County, Lawrence, you see people running and exercising.

- **FACILITATOR:** It’s so beautiful out here you might get tourists wanting to ride their bikes up here.

- There’s been talk about it in the past, now they kick themselves in the butt. I’m not for the trail. That’s just way too much maintenance with areas around Stranger Creek flooding all the time.

- I know that bikers around here have complained about the people driving and the roads being narrow and if there’s a tractor or a truck bringing grain and you have three bikers, people get really nervous and scared. I don’t know how they could not see that there’s a problem. The backroads are all gravel so you really can’t bike on them. There’s a reality that it probably wouldn’t work out here.

- Only if it’s revenue neutral, I’d love to have a bike trail or hiking trails but I would be concerned usage would be low.

- Kansas Wildlife Park have a reservoir and hunting thing, go put trails up there.

- Once you put the trails in, that’s a lot of maintenance. It’s not a one-time expense.

- **Do you think there is a need for rural transit services in Leavenworth County? Why?**

  - No.

  - I’m not personally aware of anyone who needs that.

  - They have one service, don’t they?

  - I don’t know enough about it to know if there’s a need. I’m sure there is but is it something the county should do or can it be handled by someone else?

  - If we’re busing people in here to work, I’m for that.

  - **FACILITATOR:** A lot of communities are looking to do more public transportation, and we’re trying to assess whether there’s a need for the community or not.

  - That could create jobs, if they could actually drum that up.

  - Can we bus the people that don’t have jobs somewhere else?

  - **FACILITATOR:** So it doesn’t seem like it’s a big concern.
Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of more STEM education services within the county?

- Not if it costs more money.
- Are there grants? Or would it cost the county?
- I would think the schools would be the lead for that.

FACILITATOR: What about adult education?

- My opinion is that there's probably that in the schools already. It's a cultural issue, math is hard, a lot of kids avoid it, so I don't think until you get that motivation in, having more won't help.
- They have a great STEM program here at Pleasant Ridge.
- It's kind of generational, they're pushing it more and more.
- No, I don't know if it's a priority.

Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of a community center?

- That's the idea I had about the business park, and make that into a fun place where people can go. Think about our weather, how many days do our kids get to play outside? So yes, I think they should. A swimming pool or waterpark would be nice.
- I just came from the community center and there were like four people there in the entire building. I've taken my kids for toddler time and it was my kids and like one or two others. I don't think we're using what we have.
- My thought is, we've gone from a society that is catering to Baby Boomers — you see this from Eagles, Elk Lodge, Rotary clubs, those organizations used to do a lot of donations for STEM, sports, athletics, but those are all dying out. Those organizations all had their own private swimming pools and the city didn't have to focus on parks and rec because those organizations take care of them. And now it's hard to invest money in it because they're more short-term. Maybe like an industrial business, you want something that's going to last 20 years. Maybe the Millennials don't see themselves working anywhere for 20 years. It upsets me because I see kids doing robotics and stuff, and I work for county extension office and people think 4-H is just animals, but they don't understand there's robotics, rocketry, photography. We have more entries for those than animals.
We know we’re not reaching out to the children. We’re nervous that between all the high schools we have 1000 seniors graduating and we can’t retain 100 to stay and live in the county. They’re going to Johnson County because that’s where jobs are at. Churches decline in congregation. It’s tough. I’m a big believer in investing in youth and kids.

- Was that Riverfront Community Center? I guess that’s a city property as opposed to county. It’s there, I like it, it’s underutilized, but that’s a driving issue for all the rural areas in the county. I don’t think there’s a plus in putting one in the county.

- Since we’re only 15 miles wide by 30 miles wide, we can all get to fairly good community centers.

- **What other concerns regarding economic development do you have?**

  - For the consensus of most of the group, it was what do you see as a priority? And they said what all isn’t a priority, but what is the priority? It didn’t seem like we defined everything. What is in the back of everyone’s mind? Me personally, I was born and raised here and it seemed like Leavenworth was booming and a great place to be and moving back I see homeless people. I take kids to the park and there’s needles in the corner and more property damage and abandoned houses and revolving restaurant businesses. I’d like to see more and the taxes are getting ridiculous. I’d like to see no additional taxes. Let’s figure out where our money is going now and appropriate it where it needs to go to make the city benefit. I think we need to take care of what we’ve got before we take on more.

  - What she said. I think we need to facilitate natural growth or make the county better naturally. I think a big way of doing that is if Leavenworth had the best value for property taxes, you could have a nice house in Leavenworth County and pay only 60% of the taxes that you would in Johnson County, then I think you’ll start to attract people naturally. The type of people you want, like homeowners. The county budget, in my opinion, is crying out for a really good scrub. Our taxes since 2015 have gone up 30%.

  - I’ve had taxes go up 20% in one year. What’s different? We still don’t have a fire department.

  - I think that we need, the county doesn’t have slush funds because businesses are not here so we’re always in a reactive mode instead of a proactive mode. County Road 1 was proactive and it backfired on them. I don’t know what the standard is but that’s going on 10 years and it didn’t happen. To me, if the county was going to invest money in businesses right now, it’s going to have to stay towards the Basehor area. Lots of examples of development not happening. I’m a little prejudiced towards Tonganoxie because they have failed to live up to their part of the bargain. The county had to negotiate because they couldn’t pay their portion of the infrastructure bill. So the growth is happening along 7 highway
and I think we need to change our image to not come across as so anti-business. Everybody would say we’re not and you go right out the door and talk and everyone would say we are anti-business.

- I think the commission, and I’d be interested in your opinion on this if I have the wrong idea — I think there’s a big cultural factor rural America as a whole is dealing with. I think for old guys like me, we used to like having our own place with space around it. If we had to commute to work that was all right and if we had Pizza Hut for dinner we were living large. The 20-somethings want to live in urban areas because they want variety, they want different restaurants and experiences. If the county spends a lot of money, I’m not sure they can fight against that cultural trend.

- I hear what you’re saying, but what we look at is more towards the big primary industries. It does seem Millennials like to live close to where they eat and play like you said.

- The only thing I’d like to see from Planning and Zoning or the commission is to stay strong to the policies that are in place. I know you’ve had problems with issues with 5-acre lots and someone else is trying to switch it to 2.5-acre lots. I have no issue with that if it’s adjoining city limits and the city will provide the infrastructure for those houses on smaller lots. I know with Basehor doing all the spot annexations all over the place, that’s just a nightmare.

- I do think we have to overcome that. We’ve lost a couple of projects because we don’t want to deal with that attitude. So it is something we know we have.

- I know someone with 55 acres developed for 130 houses and it failed because they’re not giving the developer an exact answer on the sewer line cost. He signed a contract to that developer for six years and then when the economy went to poop, he didn’t resign his contract with the developer. So I think, like I said, go after those businesses and create some jobs.

- We have equestrian places because I had to look some up for an international person who wants to let her daughter ride a horse for less than $40 an hour. There are a lot of them. That would be fun, just a lot of insurance and woodchips.
Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?

- I like it.
- I think it’s all right.
- The cities are more growing than the county itself. I’d like to see the county grow more.
- But that’s the main purpose of the city, they’re trying to discourage it because they can’t provide the benefits of the city to the county.
- I’m thinking the opposite, I’m more concerned about people leaving the county than people coming in. The lifers and young folks going to live in Wyandotte County.
- I think you’re going to have Basehor and Tonganoxie whether you want it or not.
- It’s closer to bigger cities in Wyandotte.
- More services provided down there.
- Originally when that started, those people were moving from KC and the south because the taxes were a lot lower.
- Growth is natural, it has to be accepted. Taxes are increasing, you have to accept that. But it has to be managed, recognized upfront, procedures, policy functions that can take it down the road progressively.
- It needs to be equitable to all the people paying the taxes.
- It needs to be based on what they need for the county.

Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.

- Within cities — 6
- On the edge of existing cities — 5
- Undeveloped rural areas — 1
Why did you answer the way you did?

- I think each type of development needs to be in a certain location. High density in the city, larger lots on the outer edge, but in the county we don't have the infrastructure like Johnson County, the population, interstates, sewer system. People from Johnson County are moving here, but they want to have their piece of the county. Growth should occur in a controlled manner across the county.

- No problem with residential growth, but industrial and commercial doesn't make sense. You don't have the resources to support it. So those need to be in the cities that can serve their needs.

- I agree with that, if it's on the edge of the city, if the city has the ability to extend resources out, like the County Road 1.

- If there's good possible development in an area, then there needs to be some provisions that if an industry is going to come in and wants a rural area, they have to be the bill-payer. If you need changes to road, water lines, sewer, whatever you need, somebody has to be the bill-payer.

Should the county adopt policies to encourage residential growth in areas where infrastructure and services currently exist or are planned for?

- I think if a developer is going to develop a certain area, he needs to meet the standards for roads to get access to the property, according to regulations adopted by the county.

- I don't think — I think the thought of development is too broad of a term. Each type of development is different. High-density residential absolutely in the cities where infrastructure exists, where cities can provide sewer in a reasonable amount of time.

- I want to bring up a point: Is there a list of functions that the county can do that is called "infrastructure?" A lot of them are going to overlap into other functions. What is infrastructure? We just had a great move to expand the commission to five people, that's a great reorganization, to me that's an infrastructure problem. Do we need to change the structure of the government? I'd like to see a list of what we're talking about in infrastructure. Has to be looked to business or individuals to do it. There have to be provisions. We're not going to put a chicken processing plant in Tonganoxie, was it a response that they didn't want that because it was
processing chickens? Was there smell and environmental issues to that?

- **Should Leavenworth County adopt building codes for new dwelling units and commercial structures built in unincorporated areas? Why or why not?**
  
  - How would they enforce them way out in the county? They'd have to hire more people, more cost.
  
  - Which means higher taxes.
  
  - Expanding capability of the organization.
  
  - No, not at this time.
  
  - I don’t think so, is there a reason there aren’t codes in the county right now and what would be the benefit?
  
  - You have to be compatible with your neighborhood.
  
  - Maybe basic electric, safety reasons, make sure it’s getting installed correctly. But I don’t think an overall book of codes needs to be included.
  
  - Light safety, they do inspections of septic systems, which you need to do, you don’t want raw sewage getting into creeks.
  
  - You gotta have controls out there because people don’t know what they’re buying, if you do a shoddy job with electrical wiring and water running up hill.
  
  - What is the distribution of rural water?
    
    - It’s coming out of the city. Anything east of this tower was in a rural water district from Leavenworth, now it’s expanded further than that. They told him they were going to be selling a million gallons a month at this tower, but they were going to be short on it.
  
  - You’re telling me that there is rural water across the county?
    
    - Yeah there are some blank areas, but 90% of the county, it’s pretty well covered.

- **If the county adopts a building code program, who should pay for the administrative and inspection costs? The property owner, the county, or a combination?**
• Combination
• Oughta come out of your taxes
• More of a combination
• That protects a lot of people, you gotta set it up to benefit people to have it, it can’t just be a deterrent,
• Combination

• What should be the determining factor whether a gravel road is paved?
  • Traffic load.
    • I went down and talked to the county administrator, I’ve been upset, and I said, “It makes no sense for me to tell you to come out here and fix this road.” They’ve got dump trucks and operators, it’s expensive to come out there. I just put $600 worth of rock in my driveway. The guy said what costs you the most? Rock roads or chip and seal. He said, “It’s obvious chip and seal’s a lot cheaper.” But we don’t have them because the initial cost is higher. Every time it rains within two or three days the roads are out. You’re driving in mud. They need to take a look at it, how many families live on that road, so they need to do the one that’ll help the most. Northern Leavenworth County isn’t getting any of those roads, it’s all going south. All our taxes are going down there. By Tonganoxie Lake, I never got on a rock road. I was shocked. If it’s north of Leavenworth, it’s north, if it’s south of metropolitan Leavenworth, it’s south. That’s where all the roads are good.
  • Traffic count.
    • Really need to watch those because the people that know how those work can greatly influence the numbers. That county road goes across there, they drive across it 10 times a day and that’s 100 hits. That little piece of road gets a lot of cars on it all of the sudden.

• Who should be responsible for the cost of improving gravel roads? Developers? Taxpayers? Or some combination?
  • Combination. [Group agreement.]
  • When I lived in town, that block and a half was rock road. Back in the 60’s. Some guys cut across a ditch. First thing you know, they want to chip and seal. They paid for it with taxes.
• **Should the county invest resources to build more north-south connections in the county? Why?**

  o Yes, I was on a committee 15 years ago about County Road 30 and that was supposed to be done with the one-cent tax, and only the first phase got done, but then it was taken off the table. I know that the county is battling Stranger Creek and the flood area, so that makes it difficult, but the philosophy was to create a grid so people on gravel roads wouldn't have to go far to get to paved. Then you could fill in the gravel roads. Trying to keep driving time on a gravel road to a minimum.

  o We have one that’s supposed to be a fast road going through Leavenworth County, which is 20th Street. Everyone wants to be able to go across, and they made a scenic loop of it and they got fire stations, low speed limits for schools, and now nobody wants to travel that road, hardly.

  o Are you going to ask that question for east-west too?

  o The county needs to assure there is some type of connection from Lansing-Leavenworth to an interstate. There are 50,000 people in Leavenworth-Lansing, which is two-thirds of the county, and your main connection is K-7, which is a gridlock. There needs to be something done. My suggestion is, I think they need to concentrate on Highway 5. You can get your right of way, you’re improving a road that’s very dangerous already. But maybe that’s not the solution. Somewhere from Leavenworth to Wyandotte County to 435.

  o No. I agree on the connection to an interstate highway. I’ve been advocating this for 25 years. Go through Ninemile creek, across the river, a new bridge and connect to 152 northwest to Parkville. That takes you all the way across North KC in dual lane highway. Lots of intersections. Through Kansas City, north to North Dakota, West Bottoms, East Bottoms, go to Liberty and then connect again. To Minnesota.

  o But do you really think you’re going to get MODOT on board? If you’ve been trying for 25 years...

  o But it’s an issue between KDOT and MODOT. It’s not Lansing and other cities.

  o Have you looked at MODOT’s budget?

  o Last comment, if you build a road such as Highway 5, which would dump traffic south of Lansing, you have exacerbated the traffic problem in Lansing. I live west of Highway 7 and the traffic all day has grown exponentially, as well as the noise. Something has to happen. Not south of Lansing. You don’t want more traffic.
I remember when 20th Street was built, there was an idea for a road from Eisenhower to County Road 7 and 20th Street was supposed to extend to that road.

- **Should new rural residential subdivisions be required to have fire hydrants and adequate fire protection flows in Leavenworth County? Why?**
  
  - Yes.
  
  - I don’t know a whole lot about fire departments in Leavenworth County and I don’t see very many of them, and if you’re going to put a large group of houses, they need to accommodate.
  
  - If the developer’s going to develop it, then they should foot the cost.
  
  - It would help attract more people knowing there’s fire protection there, you’re not going to have to rely on volunteers.
  
  - I think it’s already currently a problem that we don’t have regular fire stations and employed fire fighters.
  
  - Having a fire hydrant there lowers your ISO rating for your insurance. You’ll pay less.
  
  - The districts control the hydrants.
  
  - I can’t speak for the water district I work for, but for true fire protection, you’re going to need a six-inch line minimum. The problem is the small lines. The rural water districts have fill hydrants and you can’t put a hydrant on them. You need a heavier pipe. In that case, is the developer willing to do a main upgrade? A lot of times the developer approaches the rural water district to pay for the upgrades. I think the developer should have to pay for it. No one on the water board is against fire protections, they just don’t have the budget.

- **Facilitator: Who should pay for fire hydrants and adequate fire protection in new residential subdivisions?**
  
  - Developer.
  
  - But you’ll increase prices and kill development in the county.
  
  - That’s why you focus on the cities.
I’m also against Planning and Zoning blackmailing the developer or homeowner because adequate fire protection can’t be provided. There was a piece of property that’s going to have to pay for fire suppressant in their house. I don’t think that’s right, that they should be forced. When we had a flush hydrant across the road, Planning and Zoning didn’t recognize that. You shouldn’t penalize the property owner.

The county can’t control water districts so until they can, we can’t make it a requirement they can’t enforce.

If you want to live in the county, there’s a certain amount of stuff you don’t have. I’ve seen the sheriff’s car twice on my road in 30 years. People just don’t understand that.

Everything costs. If you want something more, you’ve gotta be willing to spend out of your back pocket.

- **Should the county create a county-wide sewer program and start building sewer lines and treatment plants near cities to accommodate new growth?**
  - How much is that going to cost?
  - Who’s going to pay for that? Sure, it sounds great.
  - Why would you build a sewage plant next to the city when the city already has one? The city needs to expand to their urban growth area so that when it grows, they’re on the system.
  - The answer is no.

- **Should Leavenworth County explore ways to incentivize internet companies to provide rural internet services? Why?**
  - YES. You know, living out in the county it’s impossible, we’re hijacking internet right now. You can’t get reliable internet. If there’s anything that helps growth, it’s information. Not just for families and students but farmers and everyone who lives out there. My husband commutes 1.5 hours, he could work from home if he had internet. We live literally less than a mile from outside city limits. I think it would be nice for the county to give incentives for development. I don’t want to have to pay the county to do that, but it’s very much a need.
  - I think even some parts of the city, like in Lansing, my only option is Spectrum.
Have you tried St. Jo wireless?
No, I haven’t.
Tree lines block all the cell towers.
I don’t think the county should incentivize it. Let private business do it. You choose to live there, that’s what you get.
How much internet do we need?
This lady wants more servers.
But wouldn’t it be nice to have a choice, and get to pay a different amount?
If you could get a lower cost, wouldn’t you want that already?
She’s saying competition creates price control. I’m paying 150 a month for TV and internet.
I guess I wouldn’t have a problem incentivizing it in the county if there’s no existing services there, and what the incentive is. Is it tax abatement?
I think it would be huge for the residents that live out in the county.
I want to interject here, if we come up with doing something about the internet, who would be responsible for that action at the county government? The government is loaded, so are we going to ask Jeff to become the internet person? We have to consider who does a function we want at the county.

- Should the county prioritize/invest in hiking, biking and equestrian trails and other forms of active transportation infrastructure? Why?
  I don’t think it’s a huge priority, but it would be nice for lifestyle. Right now, one of our employees runs on a road with no sidewalk but I think the county has bigger fish to try first.
  You’re talking specifically transportation?
  Trails.
  A lot of communities are very focused on trails.
I agree it would be nice but there are bigger fish to fry.

Doesn’t every community in the county already have parks and trails?

- **Should the county have its own parks department and provide parks services in unincorporated areas of the county?**

  - I don’t think it’s high priority.

  - We already have parks. The ones we do have, I’d like to see maintained better. I have a daughter in softball and it’s impossible to find places to practice and play games. Sports are big out here, we were literally playing in a drainage ditch. But is it a priority? Do I want my taxes raised to build a softball field? No.

  - Maybe it’s more of a problem in the county than city-wise. I think there’s options closer to the city whereas a county may be harder.

  - We have to stay kind of in this area.

  - The thing about building the parks is that cities would struggle because they’re competing with club sports. It’s a grey area for investing money because now people travel to different states to have kids play sports.

  - Club sports are coming in and taking community park space and there needs to be a change. Maybe we need more fields. But then those park boards should be charging those clubs for the use of their facilities. And I’m not sure that happens.

  - I think that’s why they have to pay the fees.

  - We’re not ready for a parks department.

- **Do you think there is a need for rural transit services in Leavenworth County? Why?**

  - No. No, no, no.

  - I mean, I’m satisfied with the county providing transportation by appointment in the rural area.

- **Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of more mental health services within the county?**

  - Yes.
Yes.

There’s really only one place, which is the guidance center, and it’s hard to make appointments. If you’re suicidal and you can’t get help right away, where do you go?

Schools have programs for that.

What if you’re 29 years old? I can’t go to the school.

**Facilitator:** Hospitals and ER’s take on a lot of mental health crisis care.

I’m presently going through foster parent classes and one of their problems is that children with more severe mental issues, the parents have no place to take those kids to get help. They can’t be sent to a foster parent home here in Leavenworth County.

**Facilitator:** This came up at the visioning event.

We do have a county health department, which I think could be the one who does more mental health facilities. And I really think that guidance counselors in our school system oughta be doing something more than just recording grades. If you have a suicide or death of the student, the county helps out. But there needs to be an expansion of the school system mental health capability. There needs to be a facility, there needs to be something.

[Facilitator reiterates the question.]

Yes, we need it everywhere.

In our drug testing, if someone tests positive they have to be referred to rehab program and they usually can’t see them for 30-60 days. Yes, the county should take the lead.

- **Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of more STEM education services within the county?**

  Yes, but that’s a school responsibility, but we gotta limit what we ask the county to do.

  Are we talking about technical colleges?

  **Facilitator:** It could be both.

  I think technical education for adults would be a good idea. We’ve been pushed about how you need to go to college when you can go out and work construction and make six figures. People don’t see that.
- If they’re not going to develop internet, then how can we develop science and technology?

- Through 4-H programs we can do STEM, but it’s a money and staffing issue.

- How many school districts in the county already have some kind?

- There are clubs and programs like FFA.

- There are a lot of facilities existing but are they being used to the max? Community colleges, clubs, counseling, where it needs to be done is where there’s nothing going on. Sometimes the communities have to take the responsibility. I don’t think it’s a county responsibility, I think it’s a school one. I think many of the schools already have STEM.

- Facilitator: How about adults?

- Community college.

- Some do, some don’t.

- Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of a community center?

  - No

  - No

  - I’d rather see money put into what we already have. The community center that we have provides a very limited amount of programs and availability. Finding meeting spaces for kids’ activities is really hard. Boy scouts hop between school, library, community center, so it would be nice to have additional stuff, but it’s not a high priority.

  - The county built a community center for Linwood already.

- What other concerns do you have regarding infrastructure issues and growth in the county?

  - We briefly talked about the volunteer fire department, but what about firehouses? I saw a car catch fire and it took an hour for the fire department to show up. Response times can be slow. It’s understandable because they’re volunteer.
I think the county should explore it. We have a fire district now. Fire District 1 gets an automatic tone out any time Easton, Kickapoo or Alexandria have a fire. They get toned out. They have 3 full time firefighters that can respond, there’s not much they can do, but they can respond. Like she says, most of your firefighters throughout the unincorporated areas are volunteers. They can’t get released from jobs like they used to. I think the county needs to step up and look at that issue.

I live in the south side of Lansing, which is 2.5 miles from Fire District 1. If something happens, the first thing I see is the fire truck from Fire District 1, then police, then ambulance. We have several full-time firefighters, great crew. If I want a burn permit, if there’s no one there, they’re out painting fire hydrants or on a call. I understand fire protection is a priority across the county. We need to expand Fire District 1 concepts into other areas. Can we have a nucleus of full-time people in each of those fire districts? That’s going to cost.

You’ve asked a lot of questions, should we? But you haven’t asked what’s a priority. I want to emphasize the connection between Leavenworth and Lansing. I think that needs to be looked at before parks and community centers. I think the county will want to know what happens. My other comment too is that some of the meetings that you’re having need to be in the evening.

My only concern is being a north person up here is we got roads out because Stranger Creek Bridge washed out. It’s the last road to flood. There’s a section of the road and my question is if they’re going to build a bridge and put it back. And they had the opportunity to raise the road up, so it never floods again. We’re going to put it back in the same way it was in 1900 and no one’s taking the initiative to change that road so transportation can flow east and west in the county. I think when you have the opportunity to improve, you should.

It takes a lot to flood that road.

You’d mention looking at sanitary sewer next to a city, and I think that’s a city responsibility. I think that the county, we have County Road 1, we have invested millions of dollars and we have no infrastructure plans whatsoever. A county sewer plan needs to be looked at.

I think up here they need another access to road in Leavenworth. I hope the things discussed here are discussed at a later time.

About 15-20 years ago, when I worked for public works, there was a proposal from KDOT to come from County Road 17 to 40. Is that still around? They called it 30th Street Bypass.
That’s an expensive road. What is the expected traffic count that would carry? I’d offer because I live in Lansing that we need a bypass around Lansing. Probably 75% of the traffic going through Lansing goes up to Eisenhower Road and turns left.

That’s because you have to take that into Missouri now because DeSoto’s closed.

Desoto Road isn’t going to carry that amount of traffic.
Land Use / Zoning Focus Group North
Participants: 9

- Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?
  - Yes I’m excited. It’s just growth. I like growth. I like change and that it can bring in new businesses and new people with new ideas. So you want to grow and learn.
  - I’m not excited about it. Life goes on. You just learn to put up with the change and go with it.
  - I was excited to move here to Leavenworth County to get back to the rural lifestyle I enjoyed many years ago and also try to get involved with different things going on. I was on the planning commission out of Basehor for over 20 years, I’m part of the Pride group now, I used to be in the Lions, just to get acquainted with different people and the issues they have to face.

- Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.
  - Within cities — 6
  - On the edge of existing cities — 6
  - Undeveloped rural areas — 0
  - Along County Road 1 —1
  - Not sure — 0
  - I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0

- Why did you answer the way you did?
  - I’d like to see the growth within the cities, regentrification—there’s a lot of [unintelligible], for lack of a better word, in some of our cities and I think that could be turned over into fresh housing and fresh use of land for people coming in.
Growth is inevitable but the most important part, I believe, is managed growth. For example, would you want a bar next to or across the street from your house?

Well, as a drinking man, yes.

Would you like to see a city park in your area? These amenities get overlooked. It does tie your population together when you start having events and developing that part but we need the type of growth where jobs are. We want people living in Leavenworth County to have jobs.

I like to see the growth in and around cities. The problem is, we need the jobs in the county for that growth. Houses never pay for themselves. This county and the cities have turned down business and industry because they don’t see them as what they want. They want all high tech. Tonganoxie is a great example of that.

Well let’s face it, much of the growth that’s going to come is not going to be 30- to 40-year-olds starting off in careers going to be here forever, they’re retirees coming here for the rural lifestyle of the community. I don’t know how to get multiple kinds of jobs in here for the people over 40 looking at retirement or are retired coming here for a second career on the base? That’s a particular problem to Leavenworth County, not any other city.

The city or county?

The county.

I know a lot of the people in the military retire here because we’re a nice place with nice people. Going down to the farmer’s market, I’ve run into several people who retired here and are opening small businesses downtown as a second career. They’re probably 40’s and 50’s but you gotta understand that’s not their livelihood so it’s a little different. That helps with growth. And that we’re nice people.

They have the advantage of everything on post, plus they can go to anywhere in the world because we’re close to the airport.

Right, we got a really nice location.

You stated it’s all older people but down around Basehor that area it’s a lot of younger families, the schools in Basehor and Linwood are totally overwhelmed. They’re not retirees down there.

Do you favor a policy that encourages the majority of new growth towards city boundaries and preserves farmlands? Why or why not?
o I encourage it to be more to the cities. We need farmland for food. Eventually we’re going to run out of land and that’s nonrenewable.

o Repeat your question please.

o FACILITATOR repeats question.

o I want to say yes because they can handle the population, the sewers, rural water districts and handle the traffic. They’re set up for that. The schools in some of the cities are shrinking.

o FACILITATOR: Other thoughts?

o Towards the cities, yes, I don’t think the county should have a policy of preserving farmlands. But I guess if they encourage growth that would by default preserve farmlands.

o I don’t think that it should be made difficult for people in the county wanting a lot split to build to run into many obstacles and regulation.

o I believe we should go toward cities mainly because with all the amenities and infrastructure requirements you have. Plus, the fact, now I’m talking about commercial growth, not houses, if you allow businesses to scatter anywhere in the county. Today that might look okay, but it’s going to develop residential and then you have houses across the street from some business and people don’t want to buy those houses. You need to manage growth.

- **Would you support a minimum 20-acre zoning district in rural areas to protect farmland? Why or why not?**

  o I say no. I think there are circumstances that come into play that a person can’t maintain 20 acres, but wishes to have their home, because of family or whatever, in the area they’re looking at.

  o I have to agree with that.

  o I think we’re running into trouble with that because what happens when the farmer dies and divides the land between his children or whomever. Depending on the space you’ve got, you might run into this, which causes an uproar in the family. I don’t know if I could support that.

  o If you’re calling for a minimum of 20 acres, farmlands go for $9,000 an acre now.

  o Cost of a house is over $100 a square foot.

  o Shows how long I’ve been out.
Such a small plot of ground, if you restrict it to a single family home, but a developer could come in and say “I can build a home every 2.5 acres” and you get subdivisions outside city limits with no services, other than water and electricity. Definitely not sewage. It would be impractical.

What if somebody wants to divide a whole place up and right over behind the schoolhouse we have one of those, they're 2.5 acres, 2.3 acres, there are 18 lots in there. A lot of the people purchase two to get 5 or 6 acres side by side. But see we're not competing with any farm ground. But you have all those people on one road close to the highway.

That developer did chip and seal the road, pay for that, made sure rural water would service each tract.

So smaller lot sizes than 20 acres are permissible, given the county has requirements in place for accessibility, amenities and infrastructure needed.

That's what happened in the example he's given.

But 2.5 acres or 5 acres all along the road and getting a road with so many driveways and turn outs, it messes up the road.

You don’t want a lot of 5-acre lots because when city people move out here, they realize they have to take care of it and just the simple mowing can wear them down. Then the piece of ground becomes landlocked and there’s no monetary value to the county.

FACILITATOR: It's a complicated issue the more you dive into it.

We section off 5 acres for my son to build a home. He didn't want 5 acres, he just wanted enough ground for the home, so when he fenced it, he put the fence in, not on his line, but further in so he wouldn’t have to mow it. It’s wasted ground to him but we’re using it.

But then it’s not wasted.

But if it was somebody else who bought it... that wouldn’t be raising cattle...it wouldn’t be part of the family.

How much acreage is needed for a septic tank?

Jeff Joseph: 2.5

In order to handle it effectively...

20 acres does not a farm make.

No it's big hat, no cattle.
We have some of those down in Texas.

• Should the county adopt policies to encourage residential growth in the unincorporated areas into planned subdivisions? Why or why not?

  o I don’t see where the county has any necessity in encouraging growth. That’s not a county government function.
  
  o Do you mean encouraging residential growth?
  
  o Yes.
  
  o I don’t think they encourage it, it just happens and if it does happen, I like the planned unit development.
  
  o Yes, regulated.
  
  o Riley has one out south of Leavenworth, there are several around there, a whole complex, and that way they’re able to afford taking care of the road. The homeowners are paying for it.
  
  o I didn’t think she was talking about that kind of subdivisions.
  
  o Where the county says ahead of time, “If somebody develops this land, here’s where the streets will be.”
  
  o I think they oughta be able to buy individual pieces of ground. But once you have a subdivision, you have to have the amenities that go with it and there won’t be any from the county.
  
  o FACILITATOR: It’d be up to the developer in that case to figure it out.
  
  o Or say no.
  
  o On that, the developer and the county have to work together. Are you saying no they shouldn’t? The county shouldn’t be involved?
  
  o That’s the last thing I’m saying.
  
  o Ok, I just want to make sure I understood.
  
  o Oh no.
  
  o Without intervention from the county, it turns into a cul-de-sac free for all. There needs to be a plan in place, I think the county needs a plan for development. We were talking about last night how Leavenworth was planned out long ago.
• The county should make growth optimal, but I don’t think the county should plan that growth. That’s private enterprise. We can plan to set up urban areas, but I don’t think we want 20-acre lots out there in the county. If somebody’s going to go out there and build on a half-acre what do they do with the other 19.5 acres?

• Should new rural residential subdivisions close to a city be required to meet the city’s design standards?

  o Are you referring to the urban growth area?

  o FACILITATOR: Primarily, yes.

  o Yes, because it wouldn’t theoretically be that long before they’re part of the city because the city would fill in that empty space and annex the property to become the city. Otherwise you’re inheriting somebody else’s problems. You can make allowances like for sidewalks, no sidewalks until a certain event happens, knowing they’re next.

  o I’ll agree it should be meeting city standards but with sidewalks, City of Leavenworth doesn’t have a decent sidewalk in half the city. And we’ve got houses.

  o I about fell the other day.

  o On 3,000 square foot lots with no sidewalk in front of them. How do you expect them to maintain a sidewalk in front of a 20-acre subdivision?

  o But they do, so that is part of the question. Then you go to curb and gutter, which you can’t have in a rural subdivision. So I think that’d have to be looked at separately.

  o Sounds great, but what do you do with the waste water?

  o She wasn’t asking that.

  o But the cities require curb and gutter.

  o Adhering to city requirements when we’re building close to the city.

  o I think they should try, there’s always flexibility in these things, if you’re way out in the country on a side road there’s no need to put sidewalks. But some of these standards, when we do want these things, we need big enough easements to do that eventually. We need city standards for development that will become part of the city at some point.
o Sidewalks are piddly but sewers and all that—you don’t put storm water there and it becomes quite expensive to tear up sidewalks to put sewers in, which would be the first thing that needs to go.

o That’s why you have to use common sense and say it’s not viable to put a sidewalk in this area. Some things are. Connection roads for me is one of my biggest issues. You’ve gotta have through roads to actually manage today’s traffic. If we have those standards in the cities, we should transfer them to the county.

o But we’re just talking about the area adjacent to the city.

• Should Leavenworth County adopt building codes for new structures built in unincorporated areas? Why or why not?

  o Yes, because at some future date you’re going to populate the county and you’ll have county ordinances that they’ll have to comply with anyway, so that’s part of the county plan.

  o Is that part of the county plan now?

  o Not to my knowledge. It shouldn’t be because of all the situations and how much it would cost to have an inspector do it. City of Leavenworth, they have that but people still do what they want. If they want to comply they will, if they don’t, they won’t. I don’t think the county can afford that. It’s kind of like the dog catchers. What’s it cost to have a dog catcher? $100,000 a year?

  o He’s volunteering, isn’t he?

  o No, he’s not volunteering.

  o There’s a county dogcatcher?

  o I do believe the county needs uniform building codes. That’s pretty much a national standard, at least as a place to start. Then you get certain qualities that make it safer like the water in the house, too small of wiring you’re at risk of having a fire. Let’s say you don’t do it, right now we have good builders doing good quality jobs, but they wouldn’t have to. They could build a shack that’s a blemish on the county in total. Then someone sees junk houses. It’s a county slum.

  o Can you give me an example where that’s happened?

  o I don’t have to do that.

  o I say no.
• New structure, do you mean like buildings like we have for cattle?
  o *JJ:* Residential structures.
  o Not barns.
  o Don, an example of that might be Atchison as far as Planning and Zoning.
  o They have none whatsoever.
  o That would be an example.
  o Leavenworth does have Planning and Zoning.
  o But we don’t have building codes out in unincorporated areas.
  o I say no for the expense, if nothing else. There’s no way to keep up with it.
  o You will have if you get all the people to move out here and pay taxes.
  o Here’s a hypothetical. We had a tornado here in Linwood, in the future when something like that happens I’m sure the insurance companies and FEMA won’t provide you backup financing you need because your house wasn’t built to standards in the first place. That hasn’t happened but will happen at some point.
  o Ok, but I have a question. Those houses at some time when built had to be regulated? If something new comes about, wouldn’t it be grandfathered in?
  o We’re talking about new.
  o Just new things moving forward.
  o For me, that’s a concern that we’d be in a bind with that.

• *If the county adopts a building code program, who should pay for the administrative and inspection costs? The property owner, the county, or a combination?*
  o Combination.
  o Property owner. Why should I be paying for somebody else to help them when they’re building through my taxes. Why should I do that?
  o I think the builder should pay for it when the building permit is given and the house is finished, the builder should pay for that charge at that time. Even if it’s just for one individual. It could be a pass through cost. You could even tack it on to the building permit.
But it’s going to take more than one inspection.

Well, whatever, you manage it.

Did you ever try to get something done when the builder’s waiting on the inspector? They can’t even control it right there in the town. What about the county?

- Should the County allow the cities to enforce building codes outside of their city limits, but within a certain distance of the city?

  - Yeah, if you’re going by urban growth areas, I say yes.
  
  - Yes.
  
  - Yes.
  
  - No, because right now the state designates the urban growth boundary and the state hasn’t said anything about controlling inspections. If the county has it, it’ll have to be.
  
  - Too much government, and we all pay for it.

FACILITATOR: For those who said yes, why?

  - Well, because we’re going to a county plan and along with the county plan, it would be some kind of administrative county or city/county cooperative administration to handle those ordinances and enforce them and provide the inspections that you’re building these monstrosity houses with. So if we have a plan, we will have ordinances then we need to enforce them. And along with those ordinances, you’re going to have the potential fees, building fees, that goes to the county and city to maintain the city services.
  
  - I look upon that as a way to include more people. The cities will have to communicate more with counties, and I think that’s a positive for Leavenworth County.
  
  - Any rules, regulations should go to the cities in question. It’s just like we talked about before—they’re going to start creeping out, do you want to annex a shitty house? Or have the infamous street battle where E Street moves two miles and it stops, but you go over here you have E Street again?

- Should commercial development continue to operate in the unincorporated areas of the county through special use permits? Why or why not?
No, I am tired of special use permits changing the zoning regulations in this county. It's just spot zoning as far as I'm concerned. I know there's a great argument for mom and pop places, but that's too bad.

I just saw a special use permit was passed for 10 years and I see others that are every year. How is that decided?

JJ: Usually the first time they're issued it it's allowed for 5 years, and if there are no complaints, when they come back, the county commission allows 10 years. Most times there are no complaints.

At the same time, I always thought when it comes to commercial outside city limits, it's the whole idea that we should have business to push into the city's commercial zone for the tax base. We have businesses out in the county, I'm not talking mom and pop shops or working from home, but an outside structure.

Special use permits allow for gradual increasing of the type of business garnered in that area and that permits great amounts of heavy traffic including trailers moving through residential areas at high speeds. That's the problem I see.

Yeah, I think the transportation fee is too low, frankly. Especially when we have a large amount of traffic. If someone's a graphic artist, then it's something different. That's different. Whatever the stretch of road is, they should be charging more for the heavy-industry type of vehicles.

The county has an industrial park for industrial vehicles.

And we don't have incentives that encourage them to go to those locations. We should tell them, "Here's the new industrial park in Tonganoxie" but we're not saying, "We'll help you move over there," we just tell them where it is. They say, "Thank you very much, see you in 10 years."

I don't have a problem with special use permits because a lot of those businesses won't make it 5 or 10 years. They wouldn't start up or try anything if they had to start up in town. This is a way for smaller ones to get started up. Look at down there where the manufacturing plant is, Baker Construction. They started out in the county and they went down and bought that. Baker's growing to a good size. But they started with a special use permit from their home and were able to expand.

Then more people see them in town compared to the county.

Any special use permit when they first ask if granted, is for 5 years?

JJ: It's usually 5 years.
I’ve seen 3 and 1 year, too.

JJ: In some cases, yes.

So it is personal, depending on what they have.

JJ: Yes, it depends on the impact.

Yeah, I think that’s the way it should be.

Don’t put the dog kennels out in the county.

But now we have a dogcatcher so we don’t have to drop them off as much.

- Should the county have its own parks department and provide parks services in unincorporated areas of the county?

Yes. For the benefit that you actually get from parks. I think along with that, there should be a good trail system. In cities, a park is actually an advantage, it’s considered an attribute that people would want to come to. There are countless reasons of what you can do with the park.

No, I’m fine.

Where is the park ground coming from? Is the county purchasing it? The maintenance? I think it’s wonderful if we’ve got it, but I would want to know the final costs—and these larger acreages no one takes care of, is that what’s going to happen? And look at the roads, they’ve been so busy with all this weather we’ve had and is the county going to be able to maintain parks? I would want more info before I voted on that.

No, we need to look at the population and if the population is 10 people per square mile, you don’t need a park out there. If the county doesn’t do that or restricts that, as the population grows and it becomes part of the city, then the county still has no need for a park because the city develops the park systems.

I would like to recommend that we need to have some stipulation that when county roads are replaced and renewed, there is a bike trail on each side of the road. It’s pretty frightening. For them and the driver. Expansion of the road should include a bike lane, which you can use for walking as well. That would be great.

They don’t have it today.
• No, because you can’t get the ground, who’s going to take care of it, you have no security. The county does have one park. You know where it’s at? The cutoff at Springdale at 92 highway. There’s a picnic table down there. Vandalism would get in that. Besides, if rural people go to the park in the cities, they spend more money there and everything else. Leave that to where the population is thick.

• I think the amenities and the enjoyability of the park do a lot for the quality of life of a population and I think parks full of trees would be beneficial to the county.

• If we were to start a county parks department, how should a parks department be funded? General fund? Countywide sales tax? Developer fees? A combination of sources?

  o Sales tax.
  o A combination.
  o General fund. Sales taxes are regressive.
  o Combination.
  o Sales taxes hit lower-income people harder than middle- or upper-income people. Lower-income people need parks, too.
  o St. Joseph, Missouri, in 1926, they decided to set up a park system and they funded it out of the general fund and every council member lost their job.
  o Don’t vote for parks!
  o You could have user fees if you wanted to. You could have it as part of a fee added to any new building permit, added like a TIF. You could always tack it on to sales tax, but again that could be regressive if you went that route. You could have a certain fee added to property taxes for parks.
  o What about the campground that’s under the centennial bridge?
  o JJ: That’s a city park.
  o When it’s not flooded.
  o Yeah, or a swimming pool.

• What other concerns do you have about land use/zoning in unincorporated areas of the county?
I have one question. I’d like to ask the lady on the end, you spoke about the development of County Road 1, do you mean houses?

No, I want business so it offsets our contribution.

But we do not need driveways off of County Road 1.

There are a couple set up already.

That’s the problem.

You could put in a frontage road.

Does it have frontage roads?

**Jj:** Yes, the driveway access is half a mile apart.

Because Basehor is the biggest concern. On 155th you got driveways every 100 feet.

Yeah, but the speed limit’s only 30, so what the heck.

Well, my only concern is County Road 1, which is a commercial area. My feeling is if that is a dedicated commercial area, then people should not be allowed to protest a business from going in there.

**Jj:** If it’s rezoned, there is no public process.

But with that time with Tyson it was not zoned. They had a 10-year moratorium, didn’t they? So when Tyson came in, those guidelines that were approved were not available then. My thinking is they have that. We couldn’t have put our foot down, because our plan had not been approved at that point.

I know we don’t want commercial property out in rural counties and trying to stop the special use permits, but in order to slow those down, we’ve gotta make the cities more attractive and not a barrier to open a small businesses. People can’t go in town and rent a place because they want too much rent. Somehow we gotta get the cities on the same bandwagon not to make it such a barrier to open a business in town.

The bridge. The centennial bridge. It’s only two lanes. Atchison has a nice big wide bridge with bicycle lanes on both sides. And I think we’re as nice of people as in Atchison and I think we deserve one. We should discuss that.

I think they should have a trail that goes off the bridge down into the park below.
Urban Growth Focus Group North
Participants: 3

(Note, with this small attendance, this discussion took on a more casual conversational structure, with staff joining the participants and facilitators around the table.)

• Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?
  
  o I’m not excited that it’s growing. I don’t want to lose population, but growth brings problems.
  
  o Well, it’s the development in the countryside that I’m not so crazy about. You know, they have different values, the people who come out of town, than we do in the country. They really want to live in town. They can’t get along with their neighbors. The ones who live in Easton, they don’t support any of the business or community because everything they want is in Leavenworth or KC. They work there, they play there, they just don’t want to sleep there. When it gets dark they want to hide out in the woods.
  
  o But they want emergency ambulance.
  
  o They want trash.
  
  o Not prepared for county.
  
  o Then they want to manage your property because you’re doing something they don’t like.

• Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.

  o Within cities — 3
  
  o On the edge of existing cities — 1
  
  o Undeveloped rural areas — 0
  
  o Along County Road 1 — 0
  
  o Not sure — 0
  
  o I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0

• Why did you answer the way you did?
There’s no option for re-gentrifying the center parts of cities.

FACILITATOR: That would be wanting growth in the cities.

Yeah, I don’t want the cities to grow out. Tonganoxie needs some help on the interior, Lansing’s never had an inside to their city, it’s just a drive-through. So I think regentrification is a good idea.

In the city, it’s a good place for them.

How much growth are you talking about? What’s expected?

FACILITATOR: We’re not getting into forecasting. It’s just, where would we want new development to be located?

Jeff Joseph: Approximately 90 or 100 thousand estimated for 2030.

Right now it’s 85 or so?

Apartments sound good.

Does the county commissioners or government of Leavenworth County have a mission statement in their purpose of governing the county?

JJ: We do have a mission statement. [JJ comes to sit at the table.] Pretty much to control the growth in an orderly fashion. The issue with the north part of the county is, if somebody has 40 acres, they’re splitting it up into 5, 10, 15 acres and the large parcels are disappearing. That’s why we want to ask the people, “Is that what you want to see?” You’re getting the growth by doing that. Then people come in with subdivisions in rural areas. Is that what the people want to see? That’s the issue we’re trying to solve.

So the population growth and where they’re going to live is all we’re discussing here?

FACILITATOR: We have other questions. Today’s about urban growth.

And I think that encompasses much more than looking at where new population will live.

I have a hard time understanding why people want to see a housing development in the rural areas. Why? They don’t like where they’re living at now because they live in a subdivision and their neighbor mows his grass on the wrong day of the week or they don’t like the color of his house.

As far as County Road 1 is, that’s all that’s ever gonna happen there anyway. Tonganoxie has their 3-mile limit and if they don’t like it, they’ll push their city limits further south.
Somebody explain that to me. The screw up with County Road 1.

In my opinion, the commissioners decided they wanted to put in a turnpike and put a road supposedly to develop that end of the county with commercial development. But they didn’t change the classification of the area, they left it rural.

JJ: We just did the land use plan for the area and we’re rezoning it for commercial.

You are? How wide and how far up?

JJ: Within the corridor. From southern limits of Tonganoxie to Golden Road, which is 6 miles from city limits and it’s 1½ miles wide. That plan has already been done.

I was not aware of that. I knew they had somebody study it.

JJ: There were a lot of studies done.

The lady didn’t come back with a recommendation.

JJ: We made a recommendation to the county commission and they approved it.

Wow 3 miles wide? That’s good.

Are they gonna be able to build houses inside that commercial area?

JJ: There is some residential zoning.

There is now, but can someone build a house there?

JJ: It’s limited to 10 acres minimum. So they can still build houses but only in certain areas.

Where?

JJ: There is industrial zoning next to the interchange and homes aren’t allowed around industrial zoning.

So in other words, we’ll get a truck stop or two in there?

JJ: There’s commercial and mixed use. The county spent a lot of money, so we need to get something back.

FACILITATOR: So let’s go back to the comprehensive plan. I want you to get your questions answered, but for this plan we’re looking at particularly the
unincorporated areas of the county.

- In regard to unincorporated areas not governed by a city, should Leavenworth County control what type of new development occurs (residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.)?
  
  - Well, they do already don’t they? By zoning?
  - **JJ**: We’re talking about new developments
  - My answer is yes.
  - Yeah.
  - I mean, like she said, they already do. You can’t do anything without their approval.
  - Some commissioners want to have it turn into a free-for-all wild west.
  - Yes, absolutely.

- In regard to unincorporated areas not governed by a city, should Leavenworth County control where new development occurs (residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.)?

  - I know it’s all gonna be case by case, but I’d say yes, we wouldn’t want an industrial plant stuck out in the middle of nowhere with no infrastructure or roads to support it.
  - Like they were going to do a few years back.
  - When they were gonna do the airport in the northern part of the county.


  - Mixed use, you mean light industry?
  - **FACILITATOR**: For example, where you have commercial on one floor and apartments above.
  - **JJ**: Mixture of uses, retail office or industry. Vertical or horizontal.
I know they did something like that on Basehor, they left the highway for retail and a subdivision behind it. I don’t have an issue with something like that, where they leave highway frontage for light industry.

The county should protect some of the agricultural ground. The rest of it’s gonna come.

Krystal Voth: These questions are with respect not necessarily to the whole part of the county but with those areas adjacent to cities.

Where infrastructure could be extended out.

 Probably mixed use would be all right there.

Are you just talking about the north end or all of it? If you’re talking about the north end of county, I don’t know where sewer lines are. We’re separated from the city by federal land. My vote is for just housing. Not industrial, not at all.

**Should Leavenworth County adopt building codes for new dwelling units and commercial structures built in unincorporated areas within the urban growth district? Why or why not?**

JJ: Basic codes like plumbing, electrical, foundation

Which would keep people from building shoddy buildings

I suppose if they’re within 3 miles of the city they should have codes.

Three miles outside city limits?

FACILITATOR: Yes, that’s the urban growth area.

JJ: What about outside of the urban growth areas?

I don’t think they’d need to have zoning codes. Not around Easton.

JJ: Only for new houses.

I don’t think there should be one out there. But closer to the city, yes, because they’ll eventually be a part of the city. Who controls how the cities annex ground into their city limits?

JJ: It’s between cities and property owners. If they want to annex on to the city, they ask the city for annexation.

The city can’t just tell you? I think they can just tell you.
JJ: If it’s contiguous to the city limits they can do that.

As long as they’re under 40 acres.

They have more power than county commissioners when it comes to annexation. The city.

So they can just decide to annex if it’s contiguous?

KV: 50 percent of the property boundaries have to be continuous with the city.

JJ: That’s a state statute.

If the county adopts a building code program, who should pay for the administrative and inspection costs? The developer? Taxpayers? Some combination?

I’d say the developer.

I agree.

It should be administrated by the county, but developer needs to pay for it.

But you look at the number of building permits being issued, that would be $6,000 in fees added to the house.

If a developer’s got to come in and figure out where sewers and streets are gonna go, then he’s gonna hike that house price up and the owner is gonna wind up paying for it. I think that’s legitimate.

Not unless the cheapest way is, the county contracts out an inspector to do the inspection piece.

I think the county, or somebody, should regulate when they start doing that so there’s roads that go through instead of dead-end roads that go nowhere.

Anywhere there’s development, it’s all cul-du-sacs, there are no roads going through.

That was always argued for Lansing. No thoroughfare. My biggest complaint, as an example, was the county commission negotiated it out and all of the sudden 10 years later, the taxpayers are paying for that road because now they have houses in there and the developer should have paid. That was the policy that was written up.

Proves my point exactly.
JJ: That’s what’s happening right now with rural areas. People come in with 40 acres and they divide it into 8 or 10 lots with cul-de-sacs.

I used to work at a print shop in Leavenworth and I had a map, from way back in the 1800’s before it was developed, the map shows 20th Street and how all the other streets should go through. Whoever plotted out the city of Leavenworth, put that in there, they said that’s where the streets are gonna go. That’s why you have through streets in there. But outside of that they want to do cul-de-sacs.

That’s what I’m confused about, because there are all smaller communities, like Easton, Kickapoo, Fairmont, there was a master plat plan where thoroughfare streets went. So that when farmers or their kids sold it to developers, they could say, this is the master plan.

JJ: That’s what we try to do but there’s a lot of push for cul-de-sacs right now.

“We need a street that goes all the way through and if you want to develop a piece of ground, you have to do this.”

The more you let them do what they want to do, the cheaper they’ll do it.

- **Should Leavenworth County promote denser development in urban growth management areas?**

Yeah, but you grew up there—when did all those houses come up by yours?

I blinked twice over 10 years and they were there.

You’re one mile from the city limits but there’s federal land between us and the city. 90% of those people worked at Fort Leavenworth or the penitentiary and they lived as close as they could to city limits. All those people from Atchison all went through the north gate of the prison. That’s why everybody built up there because you could drive one mile to work.

Country living at its finest.

A lot of those were 1-acre, 2-acre lots.

Those farmers got a thousand dollars a lot for 1 acre and thought they were in heaven. They grinned from ear to ear.

That’s what I visualize — people trying to build as close as they can to city limits.

The thing that has developed Leavenworth County faster than anything else is rural water. There was a time when you wanted to go out and buy five
acres, it was always about whether you hit a well, but as soon as they put in rural water, you could build a house anywhere.

- There’s no internet access out in the county. You have to get it by satellite dish.

- FACILITATOR: Would you like to see the county actively working to incentivize internet companies to provide rural internet?

- No, they’re too busy with other crap.

- Don’t you have a cell phone? You can get internet.

- Sort of, but it’s not good internet. There are different speeds.

- I live out in the country and I get 4G on my iPad.

- Can you download movies?

- I don’t really know...

- You can’t because it’s too slow.

- We’ve petitioned to Sprint multiple times to put lines out here but they won’t because there’s “not enough people” living out there.

- So they look at population?

- Sure, ‘cause a tower costs money. When they were putting lines in, the valley out here was totally ignored. I’m ok with that, I just go to the library and use theirs.

- I’m pretty dumb, but I had a lady down south tell me she ran hers from her unlimited cell service, but I don’t know if you can or not.

- If you have a strong enough phone, that could be. This one won’t do that.

- You have to buy the unlimited data that costs $100 a month.

- Let those people live close to the city where they can get great internet access too.

- People keep wanting this high-speed internet out there but it seems to me it’s there...

- FACILITATOR: There are other rural counties in Kansas that have much better internet.
• If you can live in an apartment and get free internet access as a part of your rent and you move to the county and can’t get it at all, where are you gonna live?

• How important is it to you for the county to actively preserve nature areas such as woodlands, streams, lakes, and scenic views in the urban growth boundary?

  o Extremely important. Because one tree, a mature tree, puts out 40 million lbs. of oxygen per year, or something like that, and we need oxygen.

  o That’s something you don’t see in these housing developments. They’re not putting parks in.

  o At least nature preserve areas.

  o That’s what they used to call parks.

  o In KCMO, development is permitted if at first glance they’re doing roads sewers, etc., and they’re putting a park in there.

  o A park wouldn’t be a bad thing to have for every housing development. If people are gonna be pushed in there.

  o First thing they do is cut down all the trees, so put trees in the park.

  o The planning and zoning regulation — I know with the city — on personal property you need so many trees. So you’re suggesting a greenery type plan of requirements?

  o Yes, I think it’s important.

  o What you’re saying is if the person develops so much property, they gotta allow so much green space.

  o It won’t be the best green space.

  o The part that has a stream running through it.

  o I think the county should say, “If you want to develop this piece of land, then we need a park out here.” Also the county should say, “I don’t think you want to develop this area, this has a lot of trees on it, this should be the park.”

  o I think the county should support and demand having parks of a certain size. There’s all these houses around here and there’s no park.

  o And you’re saying park, but it could even be a designated trail.
o Should be a certain amount of acreage. Should be big enough to be a park. Not just a postage stamp.

o I’m of another generation, so I want it approved for UTVs and ATVs, is that ok?

o No, they need a park to ride a bike and walk and run their dogs.

o My wife took up bicycling, and I’m surprised they go down to Basehor and Weston parks.

o I go down to Johnson County.

o I’m surprised, I mean, so I’m not against it, but I’m just against the bicyclists on some of the roads. I know they’re dangerous. Where I live from County Road 33 on 92 highway back there, there are three farm family mothers or grandmothers and one of the moms got hit and killed on the highway. That was back in the 80s. But now it’s even worse.

• What other concerns or ideas about urban growth boundaries do you have?

   o Jj: Would you support a 10-acre minimum lot size in rural areas?

   o 10 acres is a pretty big lot size.

   o Jj: It’s to prevent people from splitting into smaller lots, which would increase the number of roads.

   o Kv: Trying to limit number of homes on gravel roads.

   o Well, a 10-acre lot size would take care of the sewage disposal problem.

   o 2.5 is the minimum for a septic system.

   o Oh, wow, I didn’t realize that.

   o Jj: Do you feel fire protection is adequate?

   o Yeah, I think so. What do you think?

   o I think so too. I’m asking you, Connie, because at last week’s meeting it surprised me how much that got brought up about not having adequate fire hydrants. I just, you know, we’re on the same fire district and I know we have the joint agreement. Sometimes depending on your insurance company, it’s based off of fire hydrants, and some companies just look at the map to know whether it’s full-time or volunteer. We turned part of our water district to City of Leavenworth. With that joint agreement the City of Leavenworth is
gonna respond to it. I have no problem with smaller lots if there's already existing paved road.

- *Jj: What about cul-de-sacs?*

- The cul-de-sacs are gonna have to be chip and seal, I mean paved. If they're willing to do it, they should definitely chip and seal all the property in front of the cul-de-sac. Just eliminate the traffic.

- I still think you need to put the roads in there on the map and say, that's where it's gonna be.

- *Jj: Yeah but we're getting a lot of pushback on that issue. Cul-de-sacs versus districts. Developers want cul-de-sacs.*

- I'll use an example, when I was working for public works, I did a road improvement on Leavenworth Road and there were 17 property owners involved and 13 of them had wrecks pulling out of their driveways. I got them all to sign to get chip and seal. They were worried about development and I went back down there because all those farmers that said they didn't want development turned around and split up their lots and seven more houses popped up on that stretch of road. I don't want to say it's like when a cow poops, when a road gets chipped and sealed in Leavenworth County, the developers are right on it, throwing money to the farmers.

- The gravel road that was there encouraged accidents.

- Yeah, it was that bad.

- But you couldn't get the trees trimmed back?

- It was like 5-foot-deep embankments.

- We got chip and sealed out there and still can't see east on either of the entrances because of trees.

- That was my hardest thing, when the county changed their standards because they wanted wider right of ways, you have to have the county holding up their end of the deal and trimming the trees. The county has to improve their image to gain the confidence of the public, and you can't bet on the county commissioners get elected. You get the county commissioners to overrule the planning and zoning board when you submit a 5-year permit and they approve it for 10 years.

- The county doesn't mow Santa Fe Trail.
They don’t mow to the fence line even though they own it. The county did mow some of it back two or three years ago, but then they quit. They made the brush worse.

Has planning and zoning sat down with the city and got the easiest routes the sewer line can be extended from the city limits?

*JJ: We’re trying to do that with this comprehensive plan.*

My problem is the City of Leavenworth had [unintelligible] households and now 60% of all real estate in Leavenworth is rental property now.

Wow.

The City of Leavenworth is in my opinion creating more blight. I sometimes wonder if the north part of Leavenworth, they could take some of these neighborhoods and build nicer newer homes that aren’t rental property and not create more Section 8 housing and try to bring the households back into city limits.

*JJ: Yeah, there’s a big shortage of rental housing at this point. Section 8, they’re looking for 1800 homes. There’s a lot of shortage.*

Talking about bicycling earlier, I don’t see why, if we’re gonna put up new houses, why bicycle lanes cannot be added to the roads. That’s just my thought. Safe bicycle lanes.

I worked for Lexeco, and we widened the highway from a 4-foot-wide shoulder to 6-foot-wide shoulder. For example, Santa Fe Trail, maybe petition the county commissioners to do an asphalt shoulder to create a bicycle lane. Or apply for grant money. I’d rather see them on the new highway because there’s a wider shoulder than on the old highway. But if there was a bike lane....

*FACILITATOR: I think a long-term bike plan for this county would be a great economic development project. It’s so beautiful up here, if you could do it safely. We’ve visited communities that have races between communities on either end.*

We have a large population that comes in for the races that we do have.

*FACILITATOR: Do they close the roads down?*

Sort of.

The old old highway, I take that road.

That would make a great bicycle lane.
One county commissioner argued that he didn’t want the old highway tore out when the new one came in so that when developers wanted to develop, it would be on the old highway, not the new one, so new would remain a thoroughfare.

They do have limited access on that new highway. It’s not completely a free for all. Some of them have to use the same entrance.

KV: They’ve gotten a lot stricter with it.

What I’ve seen is that the county’s got burnt by a lot of developers especially down south and they should have held a gun and said, “No development until infrastructure is in place.” Need to hold your ground and say, “You can’t build a house until the road is chipped and sealed.”

JJ: We’re trying to do that, but it’s a lot of push from developers.

I know a lot of those places have a lot of lagoons?

JJ: Actually we’re not doing lagoons anymore.

I just didn’t know about like Easton, the city has a lagoon system, so I’m sure Easton has room to grow back on the lagoons.

JJ: That’s in the flood plain so...

Oh, great.

One thing I would like to see the county do, and I know it’s going to increase growth, and I don’t like that, but I would like to see a good north-south road. It doesn’t need to have a 25-mph speed limit. When they make a through road like down on Fairmont Road, it’s chipped and sealed. It’s 35 miles an hour on the new road, which is wider than the road it empties into, which is 50 miles an hour.

That’s the thing I hate about the annexation issue, like how Basehor did those spot annexations. So to get from Fairmont road to Basehor you’re driving forever to get over to Kelley’s. Now I travel the gravel roads and come up the highway because it’s just easier. Because they got it choked down to 30 miles an hour. If the city’s gonna annex the property, then they should take all maintenance of the road.

Oh, they don’t?

Oh, no. The county was maintaining the road in Lansing by the high school.

Eisenhower was a county road all the way into 4th Street.
○ Lansing was mad because my uncle owns property on the south side of Eisenhower and deliberately let his two acres get annexed.

○ The city limits of Leavenworth are misshapen.

○ If you want to control the growth next to the city limits, then the county should make it a priority to chip and seal those roads. If you want to make the growth happen there, put the paved road there and it’ll happen.

○ Like going out Tonganoxie Road to Eisenhower. I have no problem with that being designated 15,000 sq. ft lots, tying in with city limits and city standards. But if you want to control that, then do those roads and people will follow.
Agriculture Focus Group South
Participants: 9

- **FACILITATOR: Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?**
  
  - No, I’m not excited about it. I’d like for you to leave us alone.
  
  - We don’t need any more people out here. That’s what’s wrong. Everybody that comes from the big cities wants what they had there here. How are we gonna eat if we don’t have farms? We want to continue farming.
  
  - It’s mixed for me. We’re in the eastern part of Leavenworth County and you know, I guess I’m excited from the standpoint that property values are going up, one of these days we’ll plant houses instead of corn. In the meantime, I agree, the traffic has gotten horrible. You don’t dare take a piece of equipment up between 3-7 in the afternoon cause you mess up all the soccer moms. We run cows and you can’t find any pasture to rent anymore because everybody’s cut them up into 5-acre tracts and they spend a year or two mowing grass and then want to go back to town. It’s a mixed bag.

- **Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.**
  
  - Within cities — 8
  - On the edge of existing cities — 5
  - Undeveloped rural areas — 1
  - Along County Road 1— 2
  - Not sure — 0
  - I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 1

- **Why did you answer the way you did?**
  
  - I think growth is gonna happen whether we want it to or not. As far as I’m concerned, Leavenworth County has been the best-kept secret for years. We’ve seen Johnson County continue to grow to the south, we had great access to the city, we can even get to the ballpark in 30 minutes. It’s just been a great secret. Now with the racetrack and Legends, everything’s starting to move west now. So it’s gonna happen, but it needs to happen in a planned and coordinated effort. As an example, Basehor could redevelop inside the city limits. Then next is let’s tack on to the perimeter, instead of going two miles down the road and building houses, that’s not good.
Well, if you’re close to your cities, you have utilities and infrastructure in place. But it depends, there are small places like that meat place, which is probably an ideal spot for it. It's gonna happen whether you want it to or not. It's how you control it. When I left Tonganoxie in 1970 there were 1200 people. Look how many are here today.

Can I ask a question to you guys? What about growing outside of town? I do understand 80 and 160 and everybody buying it and eventually cities are gonna grow, if we have a little growth outside of town, some of that ground will still be there, but not all of it.

I guess when we start hopscotching all around, it becomes a problem 'cause we don’t have the infrastructure. Pretty soon the city wants to put a 24-inch sewer main on your property as a farmer to reach this subdivision and my biggest fear is they’re gonna ask you to pay for it. It can happen.

It has happened.

As far as growth outside the cities, I think that should be up to the landowners whether they want that or not. But that's not how it is in the statute.

It should be up to the landowner, the farmer, whoever, to make changes to their property, shouldn’t be controlled by others.

But then it affects other people like the neighbors. You can let people go in and do anything they want.

My neighborhood wants to maintain property the way it’s been. Without unnecessary regulations. We don’t know what the ultimate plan will be, there’s a lot of information that’s scary, but we can’t get a definite determination of what the ultimate plan is gonna be which is why these seminars are good so we can express our feelings.

I agree, the state statute that allows cities to take over land use and zoning outside their city limits, if the county grants it, that’s pretty scary, at least the first draft I saw is very broad and if I wanna plow my pasture out is that a land use change? Do I have to get permission from the city? That’s concerning to a lot of farmers in the county. I think some education would go a long ways to what is the intent, what the deal is gonna be. If that could be explained, that land use is talking about commercial development or residential development versus how land is used.

There was a presentation given to the Basehor Planning and Zoning Commission in April and the attitude was that it’s all gonna grow and the only reference he made to us was that the only hitch you might have is if you
have owners object to this plan. He talked about an interlocal agreement, and that’s when the landowners and residents come to an agreement for just their area.

- One comment I’ve heard is, again, you’re a landowner outside city limits but the city takes control of your land but you can’t vote on the city council. That’s taxation without representation.

- The statute states how the city set up their planning and zoning commission, they have however many seats they choose, but two of the members have to live outside the city limits within the three-mile zone. I couldn’t find any reasons why that was included but we can assume it’s to give representation to those of us in that area. It just so happens the chairman of the Basehor planning commission lives outside the city and he is the only one in favor of the comprehensive plan. That’s another fault in the wording of the statute.

- **Do you favor a policy that pushes the majority of new development towards our cities and preserves farmlands? Why or why not?**
  
  - Absolutely.
  
  - Pretty much self-explanatory; keep it in cities to preserve farmland.
  
  - Well, from my statement earlier, high density should go to the city and expand it out but are we preserving farmland for farms or for development later reaching it?
  
  - I think the city benefits by not sprawling out, that whole urban sprawl is more difficult to support just ‘cause you have longer lines for all your utilities. Fire, police protection, and all that. If you look at the southwest side of Kansas City and if you want to live in that environment there’s plenty of room down there.
  
  - The city might enforce code but they don’t have to provide services for the people who live in that area.

- **Should the county adopt policies to encourage residential growth in areas where infrastructure and services currently exist or are planned for?**
  
  - Yes [unanimous]
  
  - Same concerns.
• Goes back to the owners of that property to choose. If they want to maintain the rural atmosphere, that should be it.

• **Should the county regulate the minimum size of rural agriculture parcels of land?**

  o [Jeff and Facilitator explain why this question is being asked and what the current minimum size is.]

  o You're saying 40 acres is considered agricultural?

  o **Jeff Joseph: Yes.**

  o So the county is gonna regulate, they should require a minimum size to build a house. Somebody that wants to raise chickens or goats. 40 acres takes out truck farming, aviary, there’s concern with keeping 40 acres. The 40 acres does keep some benefits that you would lose. You probably can tell I don’t like a lot of regulations. Forty acres, you can get some savings on taxes and fees from Planning and Zoning. You’re allowed to divide the property however you want. There are benefits. I’m not sure if you have to apply for a building permit.

  o As for the size, you can have agricultural activities on something a lot smaller than 40 but some things like benefits — those may not matter.

  o Since I began studying the statute it’s been changed in definition. If you have 3 acres or above it’s classified as agricultural.

  o Then the county is more strict than state level. I think if I guy wants to farm with 10 acres he should be considered a farm. If he can produce something on 5 acres, you can.

  o First season of hemp is coming up this fall. It’s going to help out a lot of smaller farmers.

  o If you’re concerned about the availability of farmland, even if it’s smaller parcels, then the easier it is or the more incentive they have to leave it as an agricultural use. It may not be as good as 40 acres but it’s more likely to be used for that purpose instead of a large lot into a suburb.

• **How important is it to you for the county to actively preserve nature areas such as woodlands, streams, lakes, and scenic views?**

  o I say look at Lawrence driving down K-10, it looks like a wasteland, it looks horrible, and that was all made for preserving the animals and the geese. You see all the animals crossing the road 24-7, always getting hit by cars, it looks
horrible. I think if you keep people away from those areas that’d be ok, but if you don’t, what’s the point of preserving it?

- We have so much floodplain in our county that nature preserves it itself, government protects it, like Stranger Creek right now, that’s actively happening.

- This low-lying land here in Basehor, there isn’t a road at every mile intersection cause it’s all in floodplain.

- Are they trying to keep growth away from that also?

- It just kind of happens that it stays away from it because of flood insurance, which has gone up crazy since 2012.

- Hard to get a building permit to build in a floodplain.

- I like scenic stuff. I don’t mind having the views.

- If the county wants it they should buy it and preserve it, I don’t want to see it forced on somebody that that view is important, they should keep it.

- One of the prettiest places in the county was where Leavenworth crosses Stranger Creek but we screwed that up ’cause we built a new bridge there.

- Do you think the county should take the lead in exploring new possible agriculture assets that could be marketed to bring in agritourism dollars into the county?

  - Just exploring? Yes.

  - I’m gonna say no. That’s just another waste of taxpayer money and if somebody that has an agricultural business and is a farm and they want to mess with agritourism, I’m all for it. I’ve got neighbors doing some of that but I don’t see the county needing to waste any money on that. If the market will bear it then, yeah. Let’s let our free economic system do its work.

  - There was a family in the south who applied to have hay rides and pumpkins in the fall and if the county does a study they could look at the popularity and success of that one, and to see how it goes and maybe promote from there on. If somebody wants to do it, if the county can’t do it.

  - FACILITATOR: The county could promote it.

  - I’m against it for the fact of the traffic it brings. Like Ted’s sunflowers, it’s a pain in the butt up there. If you live there and you have a heart attack you’re
SOL: It’s terrible.

- I thought they addressed that with a parking lot on the property.
- Doesn’t matter, they come from everywhere. People were coming up off the turnpike and only one person could get off at a time.
- That right there shows there has to be a lot more thought going into it. Is it worth the infrastructure for just one business?
- We shouldn’t have to pay for all the police, they’ve had so many accidents down there.
- Does he charge?
- He’s got money boxes and you put your money in there if you take a flower. He also sells a ton of water. And now they have Sunflower General where they sell other stuff.

**FACILITATOR:** Agritourism can also include wineries and so on.

- But all the people that live around them are paying dearly.
- I think across the river in Platte County you have a lot of places like that but it creates their own flavor of local industry. Is this something we want out of Leavenworth?
- **FACILITATOR:** It could generate new sales tax dollars.

- They do need to do impact studies to make sure the infrastructure will handle it. The roads couldn’t handle the business and that should have been taken into consideration.
- Now they’re talking about paving Woodend Road because of all of that. That’s gonna be another can of worms and expense and we as taxpayers are gonna have to pay for that.
- I don’t have goats so I can’t do goat yoga but I have been thinking about doing hug a cow.
- I’ve got billy goats you can have.

- How important is it to you for the county to preserve land for agriculture rather than commercial or residential development? Are there specific areas you would like to see the county work towards preserving?
- Our neighborhood.
- County road 1. We shouldn’t have ever got the turnpike.
- At least we didn’t get Tyson.
- That’s right across the road from me so good thing.
- I think they have them already, Lewis and Clark, state lake, if it’s got historical significance, they should maintain it but it’s at a cost.
- I’m sure. I just don’t know what those areas are.

- Should the county prioritize/invest in hiking, biking and equestrian trails and other forms of active transportation infrastructure?
  - No.
  - I don’t want to pay for it.
  - Well, the city of Tonganoxie got some kind of funds to put this trail out here. So within the city it should be handled with the city and whomever they choose to come up with the money.
  - It’s a luxury, if agritourism takes off then we can use that money for it. If it gets the bike riders off the Tonganoxie Road, I’ll vote for it.
  - That did come up in the earlier meeting. A lot of these issues are, let’s face it, they’re all land. Trails or places to run or bike that could benefit from developed roads. If you develop a road that’s able to be used for bicyclists and a tractor pulling some equipment, then that’s a win-win-win.
  - I agree with that.
  - I was thinking of if it’s public land, if it is a public right of way, hey knock yourself out. But if you’re going to go through Stranger Bottoms and acquire land to build a trail, we shouldn’t be doing that.
  - Often the folks who benefit from that are the ones who don’t have access to nature themselves — the ones in the cities. The thing I brought up earlier was just planning for that capability, instead of just omitting it entirely. Even if you’re not gonna develop it, if you’re at least planning for it and someone wants to do it later on down the road, or if someone wants to volunteer, that happens on post, too; they’re the ones that go out and upkeep them. But if nobody’s planning for it, it doesn’t happen.
- It goes back to having to acquire private property.
- They may not have to acquire everything.
- Have to find someone who’s okay with people traipsing through their land.

- **Should Leavenworth County explore ways to incentivize internet companies to provide rural internet services? Why?**

- I'm all in favor of that. There’s cable that goes down 158th Street and fiber down 158th Street, but all I can get is a DSL line and it sucks. My download speed is like 2.5 and it’s ridiculous. I think it would be good. There’s a statewide initiative going on. Farm Bureau and Kansas Livestock Association are working on statewide legislation. That is the future. One of these days all of it will be coming through the internet.

- Already does. For those of us who can get it.

- I can see a value for farmers to use that in a better way.

- Yes, we have equipment we would like to be able to use, but we can’t. Being able to have cameras out there to monitor. You can’t use it because it demands some sort of connectivity.

- My phone is faster than my computer at home, which is pretty sad. Even for the farmers, my dad's 90 so he's not on the internet, but anyone else actively farming is on the internet. Buying, selling, looking up parts, you name it.

- Not to mention Amazon and getting products. These days you might only be able to find it on the internet.

- I would think the county could promote it. If these companies are looking for right of way access and so forth, like ok, we’ll give you that if you make sure everyone gets hooked up.

- We’re not reinventing the wheel.

- I don’t think the county should be an ISP, but finding ways to incentivize it, make it more beneficial for another company.

- **What other concerns do you have regarding agriculture lands in the unincorporated areas of the county?**

- This is a crazy one, but anybody that moves to southern Leavenworth County oughta be required to take a course on road safety around farm equipment.
That’s my biggest fear. I had a feed truck get side swiped because he had to swing out and someone tried to pass him on the right side. Narrow roads, busy through the spring, summer and fall. Not so bad in winter, but it’s an issue. I finished drilling beans on County Road 5, and I finished it at 4 o’clock and I waited till about 7 to take the drill back.

- FACILITATOR: Maybe something could be done, to help educate people about driving safely around farm equipment?

- I’ve seen it on social media but not everybody sees that.

- Around road construction, too, streets blocked off and people going where they’re not supposed to.

- I think Joe’s comment — the landowners oughta have the ultimate say and the right to decide, particularly ag folks, the right to decide what they’re doing with as little intervention as possible.

- Farming is not as lucrative as it used to be. That is their investment and their livelihood. And what if their (land is) labeled ag-preserved and they can’t divide their property up because of a decision that was made by someone else?

- If we don’t put our farm in a trust right now and all this goes through, is it true that if one of us dies, that our kids won’t be able to save the farm?

- I don’t think so.

- Doesn’t affect use at all.

- Krystal: I think it’s more a product of kids aren’t coming back to farm and they end up with a piece of property that they have no interest in farming and then it gets sold out of the family. But as far as the county’s concerned, no.

- JJ: A change of ownership has nothing to do with Planning and Zoning.

- Your property is over by County Road 1? The comp plan came into business industries down that road. It’s my understanding that as long as you farm and continue to farm, it will always be farmed. The owner has to make the decision to change the use.

- I understand if we don’t get it in a trust they’re not gonna preserve it.

- That may be a taxation standpoint. That may be what you’re thinking of.
- Have you heard anything like that?

- Do you think your children aren’t gonna continue to farm it?

- Well, you don’t know what your kids are gonna do next year even!

- Putting it into a trust makes it easier to get to the kids. But the kids can do whatever they want with it in a trust.

- When you get to the urban growth discussion, you may want to make those two hours.
Economic Development Focus Group South
Participants: 12

- Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?
  
  o I’m excited. Well, I like to see us moving forward. I’m always hopeful that we’ll improve our tax base so that we don’t have to pay so much on property taxes and I see this as the only way to do that.

  o We’ve had a couple of new businesses open in town and I think that’s really exciting. You can look at the Myers Hotel, a very historic place, it’s nice to see that it is still up and running. We have a new restaurant in Tonganoxie, we can actually go out to dinner and get a good meal.

  o You can get a drink after 8 o’clock.

  o If you want to go get a burger you can and I’m not saying that’s bad, but it’s nice to have some place a little nicer. Yeah, and I think most of us like people so it’s nice to see growth.

  o I’ve lived in Leavenworth County all my life, grew up on a farm and the area where I live now is still semi-agricultural and I’d just like it to remain that way. I don’t want to see growth in that area. There was a farm sold just north of us, and we wanted to change it from 5 to 2.5 and the developer made a statement that he’s not going to farm it or sit on it, he’s going to get the zoning changed and put 120 houses there. I agree that taxes need to be increased to cover certain issues in the county, but a big problem with a large tax base and you have a few people in charge deciding where that money goes. That’s going on in Jackson County, MO, right now. People were hit with a 3-4% increase in property tax. So growth in a controlled fashion in the proper areas is good.

  o Jackson County has not kept their property tax database up to date with market values.

  o It’s been 18 years since they did an assessment.

  o There’s going to be a huge increase when they finally catch up.

  o My valuation went up dramatically. We go up steadily every year. I don’t know, maybe I’d rather have one huge one in 18 years than this constant...?
o How can that person utilize his land the way he wants to, that would be in keeping with your vision for how you want to live?

o If a person is going to purchase a piece of property knowing that zoning is how it is, then that's his problem, not ours. Deal was made before the adjoining landowners had the opportunity to buy the property.

o I would say I think growth is good. I come from a small town, we chose Tonganoxie, we looked at a lot of different areas that we could possibly go to. We wanted that small-town feel, we wanted our kids to be in good schools. We wanted the kind of town where everyone is at the football game. The town my wife grew up in found out their only grocery store is closing. I think if we're not growing we're dying. That being said, I think not all growth is good growth, I think it has to be tempered. When I look at the county in general, I feel like Tonganoxie's being ignored.

o A lot of us feel that way.

o Lansing feels that way, too.

o We're the ugly stepchildren.

o It's sort of like they have to deal with us, but nobody really wants to deal with us. When I drove in through Basehor, you can see the tremendous amount of growth that they've had, and we've lost businesses here that have gone to Basehor because they could find affordable rents. Those are the kinds of things that I wish were happening here.

o We're going to grow toward Basehor and Lawrence. We have one new commissioner bringing up Atchison, but that's not how our location is. That's not how our growth is going to be. Maybe we don't live in Leavenworth, but we're not growing toward Atchison. That commissioner didn't want anything to do with Lawrence.

o I lived in Lawrence for 10 years and we left Lawrence to come here, we don't want Tonganoxie to become north Lawrence.

• Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.

  o Within cities — 5
  o On the edge of existing cities — 8
  o Undeveloped rural areas — 2
  o Along County Road 1 — 3
  o Not sure — 1
I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0

Why did you answer the way you did?

I think you missed one of the major ones. Along the highway.

Which highway?

That’s going to be where it grows.

In cities, on the edge of highways.

You can see it going from Basehor to Tonganoxie.

The corridor development plans that exist call for that.

Just driving in on 24/40. I think there’s a contradiction in the mission statement of this comprehensive plan. What do you do for economic development? You can build frontage roads and then you put a bunch of trees, so you can’t see them. They bring jobs and taxes.

I believe that’s what we’re looking at.

When you look at Eudora, it’s still a very rural feel to it even if it’s a half a million square foot warehouse that employs 10,000 people.

West Lawrence on the north side of the road are a whole bunch of trucking and warehouse facilities. But if trees were hiding them, it’d have been nicer. You can have industry come into an area and you can do things to camouflage it.

I think you can do that if it’s clean development. Look at Unilock out there.

Unilock?

The new business.

First tenant in the business park.

They set up very nicely.

Well, as far as development within the city, I chose that one because there are cities that could do better to take care of properties within. Basehor doesn’t even have its own complete sewer system yet. I think they should take care of themselves before they think about expanding. If you want it on the edge of town, what do you say to the people that are all farmers and don’t want
anything out there? The statutes say a city can annex property.

- Shouldn’t have moved here.

- I’m glad you made that statement because when I moved there in 1947 Basehor didn’t exist. It was still an unincorporated town.

- People say they don’t have resources, but that’s what you get when you move to the country.

- Leavenworth County was an agriculture county. People escape Johnson County, Wyandotte County and high taxes and when they complain about gravel roads, well, if you don’t like it here....

- I don’t agree with you that people want to develop within that three-mile zone you’re talking about in Basehor, I don’t think they want to immediately develop all that stuff. Does Basehor even have a commercial zoned area?

- Yes, downtown and the frontage roads along 24/40.

- So there’s no designated one like the one in Leavenworth. Basehor doesn’t have like a 20- or 30-acre place where they’d do development. If it’s always along the highway, why is that a problem?

- Farmers want to keep a rural atmosphere. I specifically stated, speaking for myself and my neighbors, and as I said, there’s only one person in favor of the urban growth area, is the one who sits on the planning commission.

- I did want to hit County Road 1, because a couple of us do support that. Briefly, keeping a much bigger picture than just my house and my neighbors, I-70 is currently being developed as an ag science corridor from Manhattan all the way down to Columbia. American Royal, Angus, dairy. Everything in Manhattan with all the animal science and pharmaceutical research that is going to be coming there, I really think our County Road 1 corridor is primed for some type of ag science, ag development piece that would fit in with the master plan and still keep it an agricultural focus and feel. I think there are solutions that work for what everybody likes about this part of Leavenworth County.

- I think when I voted for expanding outside town, I was thinking of industrial parks, not taking a farmer’s land away. We already have this industrial park out there and we need to fill it.

- We don’t do development democratically. If you own your property you can do what you want with your property, and if you’re not allowed to, you can
change that or sell it. They don’t have to get approval from neighbors

- What if all your neighbors decided you shouldn’t be farming on your property?

- I will say this, I’ve studied the statute, nobody knows the entire statute, in those PDF formats but not with a comprehensive plan, so when I started studying it before writing letters to the editor, if you have agricultural land, they can prevent you from building. Now if you have three acres or more, it’s considered agricultural.

- Do you feel the county is growing to its potential? Why or why not?

- No, I see development all around us, significant development, part of my business is contingent on development. We have projects all over, but we have no projects in Leavenworth County. Part of that is a hostile attitude towards significant development, some of it is public image. We’re trying to recover from after the last two years, and part of it is that developers want housing in the area. They want all kinds. I know we’ve lost businesses in our business park that love it but there’s nowhere for the employees to live.

- I heard a comment today that supports residential development out in the rural areas, but he qualified that saying the model he sees is you start out going for residential development, but you maintain a core center or core area of business. So, what will come first is residential and then business will follow behind.

- What do we want our county to look like? I don’t want it, I moved here, and I had a choice, and the choice I made was a county with high taxes, Johnson County and I worked — my office was in KCK — and you look at I-35 every day, you look at Leavenworth County, taxes are reasonable. Your fence had to be at least 5 ft from your property in California. So, when I started looking around when I moved out here for the rural area, I don’t want factories and traffic. I’m quite content to be a bedroom county, if you will, to where we come home at night and live our lives and we don’t have to deal with those things. You do have to drive for shopping, there are some inconveniences, but the tradeoff is you get to live in this county like it is.

- 15 or 20 years ago I talked to Charlie Gregor, director of the chamber. He said, “Residential development will not pay for itself. You gotta build sewers, schools, water.” You have to have both.

- Bedroom county is not a sustainable long-term future plan.

- Especially when you have this industrial park.
• Are you happy with the way economic development efforts are managed in the county currently? Why or why not?

  o No, my perspective is that the county has abdicated their responsibility for economic development and they've given it to LCDC and Port Authority. And all I hear out of these people is how many inquiries but I've yet to see a new paycheck come out of that.

  o I share that concern because there's a disconnect. LCDC, I like everyone who works there, the problem for me is they communicate by coming in once a quarter and doing a presentation. I don't feel like there's real interaction going on. I would think all economic development would all be housed together. I do believe that some of the problems we have, especially when we give out lots of money to build these various commercial environments, that the info is not shared property. Small groups making big decisions and we're not included.

  o We need the Leavenworth County staff to appoint an economic development officer to take the place of LCDC.

  o The biggest problem we have in Leavenworth County is no organization, we don't have a Leavenworth County planning department, if we do it doesn't do anything. It needs a development plan.

  o That's what this is for.

  o There is no communication or organization. The county hires consultants and I'm sure there'll all very good at what they do but the engagement should be happening with the city, more of that regional method. Instead of a lot of decisions made with zero engagement.

  o If there's a city in Leavenworth County, they need to be part of the economic planning. The cities and the county should be working together. That's what the plan should be.

  o We look at Basehor and how they're growing in a positive manner and they pulled out of LCDC.

  o County officials making the decisions wanted it in their city.

  o City of Leavenworth did it.

  o They all worked on that.
• **Do you think the county should be more actively involved in economic development?**
  
  o Oh yes.
  
  o Absolutely.
  
  o I like the idea of having a board with someone from Tonganoxie and one from Basehor cause that’s not how it’s set up.
  
  o There needs to be reorganization with how it’s done.
  
  o We’re not really a Port Authority anymore because we don’t use the river for transportation.
  
  o They use the Port Authority to buy land.
  
  o It's really not authentic like it was.

• **What type of new development should be pursued for Leavenworth County?**
  
  o **EVERYTHING.**
  
  o No.
  
  o Mix of commercial, industrial, real estate.
  
  o Jobs that pay above minimum wage, $12-15 an hour, full time and managerial roles. I’d like to see jobs for people in our town, they look at this area and think this is great because we can draw people from Topeka, KC and Lawrence — this is a great spot! Jobs for people who want to live here and work here. Who don’t want to make that commute.
  
  o Minimum wage jobs won’t do anything for anybody.
  
  o If we want those people to buy houses and shop and go to restaurants, we need living wage jobs.
  
  o I think we need to look also at the type of people who live in Tonganoxie, and we want to cater to those type of people. Maybe a little bit more of what I would look at is clean living. People out here because of agricultural interests, we care about what kind of meat we eat, what veggies we eat, whether our water is clean. We should bring in green companies, companies that share the same values.
Along with the environment, yes, you do need an industry that’s going to pay enough money that’ll allow people to buy a home and be a taxpayer. It doesn't help our tax burden and whatever if we just bring people that have free and reduced lunches. Something has to pay.

We have to balance growth with services. You’ll never meet that burden just on residential tax.

Would you be open to a county-wide sales tax program that focuses on retention, expansion and recruitment of new businesses to the county?

You bet.

I think we have to because we’ll either do that or on property taxes, so I’d agree to that.

As long as that went for commercial development.

I was saying the Leavenworth County planning dept is going to have a tax base to establish the staff to plan for the county.

Would it cost extra money in the immediate future to put somebody from each city on LCDC?

Are the five commissioners going to help with the makeup of that committee?

They definitely have a different approach, but I do believe I’m hoping that we’re more-forward thinking.

It's more of a government presence in the county.

What are your feelings about tax abatements or cash incentives to private companies in order to recruit them to locate in Leavenworth County?

I'm suspicious of that. In Jackson County every day, there’s a discussion of incentives to give business.

How many people have been here at least 15 years ago? Downtown KC at 5 o’clock, they rolled up the sidewalks. But in the last two years, there’s a night and day difference.

Tax incentive programs is money that should be going to civic services.

That’s all been done through TIF. Those deals are all different. The Sprint Center was built with TIF. None of that would be there without the Sprint
Center. To get the large anchor developments, you have to offer TIF.

- Are there restrictions?
  
  - Most of those deals are done for 10 or 15 years on a building that’ll be there 50 to 60 years.
  
  - That’s good if it’s right. If you’re offering it on land that you’re in essence renting out to that company, who can move out of town.
  
  - I don’t agree with TIF, if you look at Kansas City, they can’t fix their streets, their sidewalks, schools are still on probation.
  
  - That’s KCMO.
  
  - Every time they want to do something, they say, let’s have another sales tax and so you’ve got Sprint, Power and Light. That doesn't affect my life, but it affects a lot of people’s lives.
  
  - But we can just go to the Legends and see what happened there. That was done with TIF and it was all farmland and fields.
  
  - They got an anchor with the racetrack, but the first things were Nebraska Furniture Mart and Cabela’s, who were offered development deals. And then it all developed after that.
  
  - Every good, there’s a bad, and the opposite is Zona Rosa, they can’t make payments.
  
  - You can look right at Legends, all the good, but right across 435 to the water park, which is a disaster. Hopefully that’s going to get bought out.
  
  - FACILITATOR: Those are all really big examples, there are smaller examples that could happen here.
  
  - What kind of infrastructure money are they going to have to put in to bring development in? To bring gas, sewer, water all out here. We’re going to spend money.
  
  - Those are always negotiated with the project from the developer. The only way you’ll get a developer to spend more money to expand infrastructure, and they should be the ones doing it, is if you agree to offer them incentives on the back end.
  
  - The sport park out in Lawrence, I’ve talked to a few people about that before it started. All you’re doing is shoveling money into this guy’s wheelbarrow.
That’s a world-class facility.

- But think about all the tournaments and food, lodging, people spending money, buying stuff.
- Maybe that all comes back down to having the local involvement. On our last fiasco, that’s what we did not have. It was dumped on us, no one was involved. County commissioners were not involved. We need more local involvement.

**Should Leavenworth County explore ways to incentivize internet companies to provide rural internet services? Why?**

- My frustration as a former Lansing council member was that the federal government will provide incentives and funding to bring telephones to rural areas, but that law is still in effect and I approached Time Warner at the time because there was a corner of people who could not get any internet at all. I was told no, there’s not enough houses for us to start putting everything in. Wait a minute, you’re getting incentivized, but it doesn’t matter. We need a state program. I don’t know that individual cities or the county or whatever would have power to do that.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- I would like to see a fiber node in every major city so that all of our schools would be on fiber.
- I think there’s a lot of people working from home now but it’s hard for them to do it if you’re out in the county.
- I’d like to see the county do away with proprietary agreements with specific companies. Needs to be open to any provider. The incentives already in place for expanding rural connections could be used for that. I’d say no to the exclusivity of one provider.

**Should the county prioritize/invest in hiking, biking and equestrian trails and other forms of active transportation infrastructure?**

- No.
- I drove in today and I saw what appears to be several trails in East Tonganoxie.
I think trails are great, but it should be done privately or through cities and municipalities. The county shouldn’t be involved.

I would agree but up to Easton we don’t have the ball fields, so we can’t build a park but is there a way the county could do something to get a park for ball fields? We’ve done it in our cities.

I don’t think that’s a county responsibility.

Tonganoxie updated our comprehensive plan in our town and part of that plan calls for expansion of that system. When it gets developed, there’s a requirement in that area. We need you to pay for that section of pathway.

Is there anyone from Linwood here?

Me

They got some stuff going on down there. A subdivision they’ve opened up.

There actually is a Leavenworth County trails committee and LCDC is the overseer of it. We did have a section of the comp plan in 2008 that had a trails program attached and part of that was a plan along Stranger Creek, so you could have a 15-mile bike ride. The goal at the moment is to encourage cities to develop trails and the ultimate goal would be to connect the trails together.

FACILITATOR: Some regions have done those and made them economic development projects.

My hometown is up to 47 miles of trails, 3 cities all connected, goes to river and zoo.

You could link into Lawrence. That’s why we get the bikers up here.

Do you think there is a need for rural transit services in Leavenworth County? Why?

No.

That’s not economically feasible. It would be nice but it’s going to have to be part of the plan as the population expands.

I don’t think the county could keep up with private services, with rideshare, etc. That’s a part of tech that we’ve advanced beyond it.

But you can get an Uber for less than 18 bucks.
I can’t see a bus system.

- **Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of more mental health services within the county?**
  
  - State needs to, it’s kind of their responsibility.
  
  - FACILITATOR: *These questions are coming from things that were brought up during the visioning event.*
  
  - I think that’s coming from northern part of the county.
  
  - There’s more crazies down here.
  
  - With the military base, that’s a population that has a higher need for mental health.
  
  - Wouldn’t they use their own facilities?
  
  - Yes and no, but a lot of them won’t go to base facility because it’s documented.
  
  - I think the county should have some involvement.
  
  - I do see that we have a health department in the county. We have council on aging. So, we have some issues in the schools, I know they’re trying to get a social worker in the school systems. There needs to be because of the situation with the homeless shelter. They are in need of mental health support. There are people who need that support, whether it’s foster care, etc. Maybe that should be incorporated into the county health management.
  
  - If it’s not something the county can totally fund, maybe there’s an agreement with neighboring counties that residents can take advantage of.
  
  - Maybe an ombudsman-type position who can connect people with services.
  
  - FACILITATOR: *There is less stigma with younger generations about getting mental health services.*
  
  - Right now, St. John has a geriatric facility.
  
  - Young people are distressed, suicide is up, public shootings, looking at people who are mentally ill.
  
  - I think the county needs to be involved, but the state should be involved too.
But shootings began when the trend began in California where they said if a person doesn’t want to be in institutions and not in society, then we can’t hold them.

I think where I’m looking at is we don’t have anything set up in Leavenworth County where anyone who wanted that could turn.

It’s a big and serious enough issue that the federal government should be taking more control of it.

- Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of more STEM education services within the county?

  - Yes.

  - We have a school system.

  - I think the schools are trying to do that.

  - We can’t take over everybody’s responsibility at the county.

  - You have to go to KCK or in Leavenworth for that. We have vo-tech classes, but some kids can’t get there if they don’t have a vehicle. Tonganoxie, they send people who are advancing to corporations to work, they have a very good program here. Lansing does not. That’s the high school.

  - And at the elementary school, my kids both went to STEM camp this year. Put on by school director. I also like the signing days for student athletes, but we’ve now started recognizing these kids going to a vo-tech school and have a signing day. I think our schools are making strides into getting kids excited and into a program.

  - They need to pair more with the trades.

  - The schools do.

  - I sponsored my son for electrical school.

  - No, schools’ responsibility, not the county.

  - Maybe the county should partner with them.

  - The state needs to be involved in this, too. We can’t do it by ourselves.

  - There is sharing, too. Tonganoxie can’t afford on our own a full special ed program, so they partner with Basehor-Linwood. I think a lot of times when
you have students with higher needs, the districts are sharing that responsibility. I’d like to see that with more of our IT and tech.

- My complaint with doing it on a county basis would be a fear that it would happen in Leavenworth and we’ll be left out.
- Schools are really working on this.

- Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of a community center?
  - No.
  - I’d love to have one.
  - We have senior centers, we have Parks and Rec, we don’t need the county to form community centers.
  - That’s a local problem.
  - Every community is different.
  - Well, I don’t think that we should.
  - Lawrence is a good example. They have 5 or 6 different community centers. Their city manager is proposing to institute a fee, which have previously been free, because it’s costing so much to operate those facilities. There’s one in Leavenworth.
  - It needs to be addressed by our own cities.
  - In Tonganoxie, the church has played that role.
  - The school system handles it as far as the rec league basketball and things like that.

- What other concerns regarding economic development do you have?
  - Major roads and highways that support economic development.
  - Transportation is very important.
  - McIntyre Road west of the new high school that ties back into west Eisenhower at 20th street. If I follow traffic in the morning up to Eisenhower Road, so much of that traffic turns left on Eisenhower. If you would come off
of McIntyre and 147th street go around and tie in, they are building that new industrial park out there. Then it doesn’t take the traffic through downtown Lansing.

- My concern is, I’m really focused on the transportation piece. We allow within our county, with the way it’s been developing, we do not require connecting roads. So suddenly if someone wants to build something here, we don’t have connecting roads. Anything we do on the land use side, we need to focus on putting down roads that connect with each other.

- I’d like to see broader participation and cooperation at the state level. When we talk about major development, they don’t talk to LCDC. I see that as really ineffective. They go right to the state and the state is going to go to county and commissioners and I think Leavenworth county specifically is overlooked or gets what’s left from those state conversations. Really nice development ends up on the east end of the state. It goes to Johnson County, Wyandotte County, Lawrence. Having more state participation would be great, and I don’t know the best way to encourage that to happen because I think our local representatives really do try their best and have our best interests in mind. We can talk about all this, make all these plans, but if our own state is working against us....

- Or at least not working for us. They’re working for Douglas County, Wyandotte County....

- Look at what they have in common. They’ve worked on that K-10 a lot, if you look at Wyandotte, they’ve got 435. They’ve got a good transportation system. In Leavenworth County we talk about taking traffic off of the bypass, but the other counties are looking at getting out into the world and we don’t have that here.

- We’ve got County Road 1 we’re not utilizing.

- Total red herring here, but there has been a proposal to improve transport with the Patriot Highway. Every time someone has proposed improving our transit system, everybody gets out their torches and pitchforks. We have to stop saying no to everything.

- If we had easements in the county plan for these kind of roads, I’d like to do it. We have to do better at that. The Patriot Highway was actually a good idea. He wasn’t buying anyone’s house, but he was coming fairly close to their property lines.

- I would not make a move forward until somebody showed us a piece of paper.
- The idea was a toll road, so those people would get their money back.

- In my perspective, and I live in south Lansing, is starting at 3:30 am, the traffic on 773 going north is atrocious. Vehicle count is 62,000 vehicles a day. Noise has increased. If you're going to have something like the Patriot Highway, I advocate that you extend Eisenhower Road east. Take it through Ninemile Creek to Missouri River Valley and tie in to highway 152 northwest of Parkville. My objection of Patriot Highway is you exacerbate the traffic problem.

- When you look at KC though, 435 makes a ring, but when you move out from that, that next piece out there is K-7. If K-7 is getting overload, so it's time for that next development corridor out.

- The routes that I've looked at start at the intermodal, go north and then go cut across to 29 North and that's kinda the next ring of peripheral development.

- That's 40 miles of interstate-quality roads.

- The bypass in Lawrence took 27 years to get done.

- We need better traffic management on 773. We need interstate quality and cut out traffic lights on those roads and build frontage roads. That has been done in Missouri. Build a fly over.

- Wyandotte County declined that plan.

- To me, the leader needs to be someone other than Wyandotte County, and you get KDOT to support it.
Infrastructure Focus Group South
Participants: 11

• Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?
  o It’s about time. I’m born and raised here, 35 years and all I’ve heard is, “You’re a farm county,” and everyone I’ve known has grown up in Johnson County or Wyandotte County and says we’re just a farming community, but we’re actually pretty awesome. I’m a fourth generation, so it’s positive to see people moving out here.
  o This is a place people are moving to.
  o I moved here 14 years ago from Wyandotte County, from Cheyenne originally, and I’m happy to see Leavenworth County experience growth. It is indeed the oldest county in the state. On the other hand, I really don’t need any more neighbors close to me.
  o Amen.
  o It’s the balancing act.
  o FACILITATOR: That’s the goal, balanced growth. Rural with amenities.
  o On the other hand, of course, my universal admonition is simply, “Pave the damn roads.”
  o I like to see the growth, I think there’s probably too many 5-acre plots around.
  o I moved here from Johnson County, then Wyandotte County, then Leavenworth County, for the space.
  o I’m part of that growth as well, stationed at Fort Leavenworth and from there got out and figured we wanted to stay here. I’m from south Texas, left that area ’cause there’s too many people there, too. Everyone’s growing across the country. But I was attracted to the space and ability to farm. I don’t want a whole lot of people on the back end of that. Being prepared for the growth is a good idea.

• Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.
Within cities — 8
On the edge of existing cities — 6
Undeveloped rural areas — 0
Along County Road 1 — 0
Not sure — 1
I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0

Why did you answer the way you did?

I presume that most growth, my hope would be, is residential growth within cities and edge of cities. Commercial growth along County Road 1. That seems to be the direction of where the money we’re throwing to it, we want it to go. As long as there’s not a chicken slaughterhouse, I’m fine.

One you spread out growth too much, it gets too expensive, infrastructure becomes too expensive on tax returns.

One of the things I miss is, what about the transportation corridors, like 24/40? Would you look for commercial growth along those places? And keep it away from unincorporated areas? When I think about outside of the cities, I always think of those corridors and not a sand pit where trucks have to go through rural areas.

Just looking at Leavenworth-Lansing, it seems like there’s still a lot of commercial properties not filled. We have idle properties that haven’t been developed or occupied, so I don’t know if we need more capacity.

I said not sure because in my core I’m not going to tell someone how to live their life, and it’s not my business where they choose to have their business.

I would agree with that to some extent but if you let people do whatever they want, you’ll end up being affected by it. If the sand pit goes in, they’re excavating sand.

It’s not in a river but it’s in the area, and what they’ve got is a 50-foot-deep sand deposit and they’re going to excavate it and use it to make some roads out there. Down by DeSoto Golf Course on the north side of the river.

The roads to that region aren’t capable of handling the type of truck traffic they’re talking about.

There’s a lot of Leavenworth and Lansing with commercial areas downtown suffering the same problems that other commercial areas are. On the other hand, if you go look at the Crossroads Art District in Kansas City, Missouri, and notice similarities between facilities, buildings, things that are already
there, for God’s sake! Let’s start our own art community in downtown Leavenworth.

- Shopping center was opened in late 60’s, most of those buildings have been razed. Sears moved out 15 years ago, still vacant. There’s a lot of underutilized area right there.

- Essentially, there’s a lot of opportunity within Leavenworth for infill housing when you get down to it. Whether that’s existing structures or new construction, that I would hope the cities would incentivize.

- **Should the county adopt policies to encourage residential growth in areas where infrastructure and services currently exist or are planned for?**
  
  - Yeah, yes.
  
  - Also, if you want to go and develop a residential area, don’t you participate in the cost of the sewers and roads?
  
  - Ideally, yes.
  
  - I think they even backload those, there’s a fee for hooking on to water and gas, etc. Of course developer passes it on but he pays the fee. When he sells the lot, you pay the fee.
  
  - So yeah.
  
  - I know that residential growth is inevitable but I’m a firm believer in saving as much farmland as can be saved. We only have so much of it. So much is covered with warehouses and parking lots.
  
  - We should preserve natural areas.

- **FACILITATOR: It’s a beautiful county.**
  
  - When you think about the geography of this county, it’s beautiful. Where else do you get Minnesota granite in your yard?
  
  - But sometimes a big house on the hill comes into view sometimes.

- **Should Leavenworth County adopt building codes for new dwelling units and commercial structures built in unincorporated areas? Why or why not?**
  
  - Yes
Yes

Yes

I’d be a “not sure.”

I'll tell you why, I have 40 years working with sheet metal, I've seen the importance of inspections to make sure work is quality. Our concern of the implementation of the urban growth management area is that Basehor would have authority to issue building permits, collect fees and enforce building codes. Could be too stringent for those of us in the ag segment of that area. If they impose a county inspection plan, then cities cannot override it.

If there’s an authority higher than the city that sets the precedent, but a clear elected official to redress issues with.

It should be standard like they do the tax code. If you’ve got this, you can declare your area an ag area and certain tax relief benefits apply. Why can’t we do that with a building code? If you meet standards of agricultural dwelling, your taxes are a lot less than my taxes, I’m residential, and agricultural is half or less. Why would you not go ahead and apply that to the building codes? If you’re ag, you do these codes, if you’re residential, you meet these codes.

Having served as acting chief building inspector for a city many years ago, uniform building code is not difficult. It makes exceptions for residential and barns, it’s very simple. I don’t know why we don’t adopt it as a general standard in Leavenworth County and be done with it. The problem with them is you have to have the capability of enforcing it.

Coming from an engineering standpoint, this also gets an engineer and architect on the side of the county. You’re holding the builder and inspectors accountable for standards and codes. You’ve got a working team now, not just the county working against a random builder building a barn. He doesn’t have to follow codes, he has to follow what is set and he’s got a whole team going against him. That helps a lot. It’s a good thing to have.

I’ve already discussed this with Doug Smith and my neighborhood’s interest in opposing his county inspection. As you mentioned, it would take personnel, but if the cities implement the comprehensive plan, the cities have inspectors, and there’s probably a way to work together.

The rest of that equation goes, why don’t you make the whole county, essentially, if you’re going to adopt uniform codes, go to the cities and say “Look, let’s just make the county uniform.” It’s not that difficult. There’s no reason to not do that. Other than those of us who want to go out in the back
and throw up a barn.

- I think it would be a good thing to have the county involved with that. I think two or three months ago at a seminar with the county administrator, he said that the cities collect a fee from building permits, and it doesn't benefit the city and the residents thereof, instead of where it was collected.

- If the county adopts a building code program, who should pay for the administrative and inspection costs? The property owner, the county, or a combination?

  - I'm missing something here. Two years ago, a tornado comes in and takes my shed out, I went in the backyard and threw up a pole barn. I did have a company come in and do concrete etc., but there was a permitting process. I go to the county, take a drawing to them, they take my $86 and say here's your permit, which I hang up. So the inspection process fell off a little bit then, then he raised my taxes. So I guess what I'm missing is, we do have that in the county already....

  - You do have a building permit process and we did have inspectors, but you still don't have a uniform building code.

  - I think the owner should pay for the inspection.

  - The money should go for at least part of the inspection.

  - That was the only fee I paid.

  - Plus your property taxes went up, there's your fee.

  - There was not a separate cost for the inspection.

  - Jj: That would have been the county appraiser. Just looking at the value.

  - I got an addition to my house, there's not a trace of a permit ever done for it. Basically was a concrete porch area and they literally built an enclosed room. And it's still there. But the point is there's no permit, the appraiser noticed it and has had it appraised as a fully functional room. But there's no heat, etc.

  - We've talked about the inspector, what's he inspecting against if there's no building code adopted? The county needs to have a code.

  - I agree.

  - FACILITATOR: Does anyone not believe the county should have building codes?
I was just shocked to learn that they didn’t.

If the county were to impose its own plan focused on quality of workmanship without extra stuff cities impose, I’d be happy to pay an additional fee. We need something to make sure electric, etc. is up to standards.

Do any other counties have building codes?

*JJ: Atchison County doesn’t have building codes but everyone else does.*

We and Atchison are probably about the only two holdouts in eastern Kansas.

One of the things, if you involve the city, it’ll cost a lot for inspection fees. A building permit in the city of Tonganoxie is $7,000 and that’s average everywhere you go. I guarantee the cities won’t go out in the county for little or nothing. Whether you’re in Linwood, Basehor, etc.

So on a $200,000 house you’re going to pay about 3%.

But you’re not going to get a cheap fee.

- **What should be the determining factor whether a gravel road is paved?**
  - School bus route.
  - Just pave them all.
  - Amount of traffic.

*JJ: The standard now is the traffic counters every two years. Right now, they’re creating a list of all the priority roads and go from there as funding is available.*

But if you have a school bus go down a gravel road, that’s only one vehicle.

*JJ: Yes, it’s based on number of axles on vehicles.*

The reality is Leavenworth County lets you pave your own road. I can assure you that when I moved out here, I was more than happy to pay for my own road to be paved. And I’ll connect to yours so you pay to maintain it. But it was just fine. They have finally come through and paved, hard surface on 179th Street. The reality of it is, as a long-term goal, the county should set out to pave every road in the county.
• Who should be responsible for the cost of improving gravel roads? Developers? Taxpayers? Some combination?

  o Developers should participate if they're going somewhere adjacent to an unimproved property. But existing roads, that’s going to be left with the county and possibly tax payers.

  o Chicken and the egg? There won’t be development if you won’t chip and seal the gravel road.

  o To some extent yes, County Road 1 didn’t used to be paved to the standard it is today. And as part of the process, we paved it. The rest of it, the list of roads paved on a scheduled basis, is the half-cent sales tax. So it is the taxpayers. I’m sure if I were a developer, then the county would have a reasonable point to ask them to help pay for the cost.

  o And they will.

  o They bring it up to standard, but don’t necessarily have to do maintenance. Should be paid for by taxpayers, and I think it should be paid for by property owners, I don’t think it should be sales tax.

  o They came out and patched mine last summer.

  o Was there not a mid-America regional study or KDOT study where it talked about all the ancillary roads on 24/40, that talked about where they’d be chip and sealed?

    o Jj: Whenever development comes in — so that’s why we don’t see anything out there. It’s still the plan but no one has come to develop it.

  o Is there a way to access the county roads online?

    o Jj: Yes, we have maps available online.

    o The Basehor Urban Growth Area has those roads.

• Should the county invest resources to build more north-south connections in the county? Why?

  o Is that the Patriot Highway?

    o Oh, god...
Because you can’t be against anything called Patriot, right?

Facilitator: Should we prioritize more north-south connections?

(Shaking heads)

I wouldn’t be opposed to it if it was connecting. I live in Basehor and I hate going to Leavenworth. I hate K-7 and you feel like you’re in a rally race. You have to drive like NASCAR.

So pave the auxiliary roads and you’ll have your connection to Leavenworth.

Something going to Leavenworth on the western side.

155th to Gillman, to Tonganoxie, to 20th, to Eisenhower.

Are there any traffic studies that would help us indicate where to go with that? There isn’t a good north and south route.

I think Tonganoxie is a gorgeous road.

If I could just get rid of that mile and half of gravel to get there.

I think it depends on the traffic and I don’t know that it’s there.

We need to do a traffic count but if we don’t meet that standard, why bother?

I want more bridges into Missouri.

Some of the roads are already used a lot, they need to be widened to have shoulders to make them safer.

Be cheaper to improve the ones we have.

Should new rural residential subdivisions be required to have fire hydrants and adequate fire protection flows in Leavenworth County? Why?

Absolutely, positively, yes.

Because fire’s bad?

That’s only going to happen if they have water treatment or supplies from someone who has that water pressure. Most of the rural areas don’t. It’d be very expensive to do that.

There would need to be state participation.
If you require fire protection, it gets too expensive, you’re spending a lot of money.

That’s another reason to look at the disadvantage of all this annexation that’s happened in the county. That’s a bad plan to begin with.

Doesn’t change my answer, still need it.

**Who should pay for fire hydrants and adequate fire protection in new residential subdivisions?**

- It's already required?
- I don't think it is.
- The developer should pay for it.

*JJ: The water line won't support fire hydrants.*

- When my neighbor subdivided west of me, he literally had to put a new fire hydrant in right across the street from me. And bitched about the $5,000 he had to pay for it.

**Should the county create a county-wide sewer program and start building sewer lines and treatment plants near cities to accommodate new growth?**

- No.
- Yes.

*Ooh, good, we'll have a debate.*

- Yes, because septic is dated, and you have to pay for it and if you have new development you have to get rid of it. And a sanitary storm and sewer system.

- It's great for the county. Johnson County has one of the best ones in the state.

- You want taxes on the level of Johnson County?

- They're still better than Wyandotte.

- If you're asking about sewers throughout the county, no, but if it's where there's more density, someone needs to provide it.
But the problem is, if you do individual treatment plants, they can’t get operators for it. So it might need to be a septic system, which fails after a while. Gotta figure out some way to do it when it develops. That’s why we have 5-acre minimum plots, and when septic tanks fail, the community pays for it with bad streams and creeks and water.

I’ve got 10 acres and my septic tank works fine. But who’s going to pay? You going to be assessed if it goes in front of your property?

Sewer is more expensive than water lines.

Why should those of us with more than 5 acres have to have that payment?

My sister lives within city limits and she was on septic and they had her put on sanitary and storm sewer lines, and it was $1700 to get put on it. Springfield, Missouri, is huge but she’s getting a credit for being one of the final neighborhoods put on to that. Obviously, there’s a system that can be developed and created to have businesses and commercial properties and new residential subdivisions and they pay the bulk fee for all the new places. There’s a plan that can be developed. It’s not like, “Here’s a bill,” where you have to come up with this. You can pay for it in increments over time. We’re looking at 20 years down the road.

I live on a farmstead developed in 1910 on its second septic system. I’ve only had it pumped once. I’m quite happy with my septic system and I’m happy without my monthly sewer bill. I personally direct storm water runoff into my pond. I care not to pay for it. And frankly from a short-sighted perspective, I doubt I’ll be here 20 years from now.

My septic tank was the original one put on the house, 1913.

Don’t you think there was an outhouse in 1913?

**If we do create a new county-wide sewer program, who should pay for it? Developers? Taxpayers? Or some combination?**

- Combination
- Somebody else
- Developers should pay for it and you pay a connection fee

**Should Leavenworth County explore ways to incentivize internet companies to provide rural internet services? Why?**
- Hell, yes.
- Yes.
- It benefits everybody in the county.
- I wrote the Kansas internet person in Topeka because I went on satellite and now I’m LTE, my wife runs a business. I went from Google Fiber and now I’m at a satellite connection that’s double the price for half the speed. Had I known, if the county weren’t so pretty... it’s a huge knee capper for anyone used to a resource that is pretty standard now.
- My son moved away from home because of slow internet.
- I think they should treat it as a public utility and regulate it and get it going. They should say if you’re going to do business in our county, you’ll do it like we want it.
- There needs to be competition though, whereas water and sewer, it doesn’t work to have competition.
- Frankly, there’s not competition.
- I’m neutral on the subject but I understand if you run a business, you rely on that service.
- This is a problem that would be interesting to see a co-op possibly explore. There are counties in the Midwest who don’t have a provider, who say, “We’ll do it,” and then competition comes.
- There are incentives on a federal level years ago that Leavenworth County didn’t participate in because they didn’t want us to be perceived as a rural county.
- I use an LTE modem that goes to the Casey’s. We have the Kansas broadband initiative. The guy wrote back to me, says petition to your local data businesses. When I did, they said, “We don’t have plans at this time.”
- Somebody needs to twist the arms of the internet providers that exist in the world.
- Like you said, they should build their own for competition. Co-ops work.
- They get litigated by big telecoms to do that.
- We can find ourselves a good attorney, though.
• *Should the county prioritize/invest in hiking, biking and equestrian trails and other forms of active transportation infrastructure? Why?*

  o No.
  
  o Not a priority, it’d be nice.
  
  o Local Parks and Rec groups should be leading that.
  
  o Do we have that?
  
  o Not rural, but local.
  
  o There are a lot of bikers that ride up and down Tonganoxie road and it’s dangerous.
  
  o Pave the roads and add shoulders and it would work.
  
  o On the survey, I think you had that category where it’s “nice to have.” At least having a plan for what the trail could be.
  
  o A number of old railroad right-of-ways that aren’t developed and have made beautiful trails in other communities.
  
  o *Facilitator: I keep thinking about connecting trails in Lawrence to the ones in the county.*
  
  o This abandoned railroad here was land reverted to adjoining landowners. That would have been a perfect one for that. Bicycle club from KU tried to acquire all that.

• *Should the county have its own parks department and provide parks services in unincorporated areas of the county?*

  o We should ask the guys next door to do it. (Referring to the group of game wardens having a meeting next door to our group.)
  
  o Comp plan addresses if there’s going to be parks or not I think.
  
  o *Facilitator: That’s why I’m asking.*
  
  o I would think ultimately they would need a parks section of the planning department that looks at park uses and land use throughout the county.
It would seem other counties have denser population and we’re going to grow in population and then we’ll need parks and we need a plan. Maybe not now but when the time comes. It’s hard to plan for them after the fact.

Long-term plan.

- If we were to start a county parks department, how should a parks department be funded? General fund? County-wide sales tax? Developer fees? A combination of sources?

  - General fund.
  - Developer fees. This is the only place I’ve lived out of 11 states that doesn’t require a developer to build or hold a green space when they do development. That’s the way I’ve seen it in many places. If they don’t have a park, they have to hold a green space.
  - That makes it sound like a subdivision park and not a county thing.
  - In Wichita, there’s a lot of new construction there. They have nice parks in those areas.
  - There was a big article in the Star about Prairie Village and the old golf course.
  - There’s a difference between green spaces and a county-wide park system. I understand the need for green space, but that’s different than a park some place or a ball field.
  - My opinion is we have a lot of priorities. I don’t live in town, I live down by the sandpit and when I want a green space, I go outside. We play with my dogs. I’ve got those opportunities and I think most people who live out like that don’t miss a park. I was surprised at the lack when I moved here but it didn’t bother me. I don’t prioritize it. I don’t live in town.

  - Facilitator: Well, this wouldn’t be in town.

  - But again, this probably ties back in to trails. General public use areas available throughout the entire county. The rest of the equation is not everybody has that opportunity to go outside. I get bicyclists up and down my road every nice weekend. I’m quite sure they’d prefer to be on something other than a public highway. Little Stranger Creek is a mile and half west of me and it has that old rail line. That area would be perfect.

  - Let’s plan for the future but not an immediate priority.
Is there any type of federal government grant program?

Facilitator: The county would have to research that.

Let’s say you’re a developer. You’re removing green space, so there’s a fee to replace green space, so that could go to parks or any other public realm project. There’s no responsibility to replace green space.

Do you think there is a need for rural transit services in Leavenworth County? Why?

- No
- Not yet

Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of more mental health services within the county?

- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yep
- Jails are not good mental health hospitals, period.

Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of more STEM education services within the county?

- No
- I’m a teacher and that can be put in through voting of the school district.

Should Leavenworth County take the lead in exploring the creation of a community center?

- Where?
- Hmmm...
- What’s our community? Easton? Linwood?
- There’s one in Leavenworth.
Local communities need to have it.

That’s more of a city thing.

If there’s a dense unincorporated area, maybe.

We don’t have the density to support that.

When we do, something exists already.

Churches, libraries, etc., fill that role.

What other concerns do you have regarding infrastructure issues and growth in the county?

Transparency. Things like this that allow — and you’ll have people that never come, and complain — but if you have every opportunity to tell someone about meetings, issues, voting. “Did you do that? No, okay, well sorry.” Anything that is transparent limits people to be angry at the result. Democracy dies in darkness. Anything that there’s more opportunities to provide opinions.

Witness the Tyson fiasco.

I think that’s going to be a great case study for every graduate degree in master planning out there: how you can get 30% of your residents to show up with torches and pitchforks on a short notice.

The county needs priorities.

Facilitator: That’s the end result of the project. Right now we’re gathering information and then in October, we’ll work to establish priorities.

And how they’re going to deal with the cities.

I think we need to get an estimated cost for what these things entail. What does it all cost?
Land Use / Zoning Focus Group South
Participants: 14

- Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?
  - I’m excited for growth because I think the more people we have will bring more industry and things we want and need. If you have some sizeable grocery stores, I think they would want to come in an area that’s grown, and other necessary services for small communities.
  - I am. I do think though that growth is good, but I also kinda like our rural areas so I’m not super excited about seeing total population growth and losing all of our pretty scenic areas, so there needs to be a balance.
  - I agree.
  - I moved out here from Illinois about four years ago, and our oldest child has been out here since college, and we had the opportunity to sell property in Illinois which is hard to do and got out here, so we’ve seen the area for the past 20 years and the growth has been phenomenal. When my daughter first bought a house in Tonganoxie, you didn’t even know Basehor was there when you drove by. I think the growth is really good. You’ve got some beautiful homes and things coming up here. I am frustrated by it also because I’d like to do some growth, too, and I’ve been stymied.
  - There’s gotta be a balance because so many of us came out here because it’s rural and quiet. You’re only gonna grow to a certain point to where you lose that and it depends on what your personal attitude and preference is. With this plan, at what level are we trying to get this? We don’t want to destroy all the rural areas and farmland to build developments.
  - I agree.
  - We have to decide how much of it can we bring out with what developments, what industries, to not destroy what we had originally, but make things available to everybody.
  - I like the growth too, but population growth or business growth? I’d like to see more business growth to offset property tax increases that have been the primary way to pay for everything. 99% of the folks who live in Basehor work elsewhere because there is no business in Basehor. We need to balance that.
• **Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.**

- Within cities — 7
- On the edge of existing cities — 5
- Undeveloped rural areas — 1
- Along County Road 1 — 0
- Not sure — 1
- I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0

*Why did you answer the way you did?*

- I answered unsure because, for me, the growth and where it best fits, depends on what it is. You can’t just say, “Everything must go within city limits” because there are times, with County Road 1 and the highway, it really depends on what (type of) growth it is and how does it benefit the county? How does it fit in that spot where they want the development to occur? I have a hard time aligning with the idea that it has to be here or there.

- I really agree with that. I think it’s awfully difficult to say it always has to be in city limits or on the edge of the city. Landowners should have some say about what they want to do with their land, also.

- I kinda think, the reason I said “edge,” is for particularly the industry and companies to come in, you have to have access, roads, a way to get materials in, products out. You can’t look at the gravel road and expect the business to grow. You gotta have County Road 1 or 24/40, which is the natural access. Along 24/40. I don’t think there’s really any place else.

- I only tried three different roads to get here today.

- There are certain areas you can’t do anything about because Mother Nature won’t let you.

- We got seven inches of rain last weekend.

- I just want to reiterate that it really kinda depends, when you say growth, are we talking about houses or are we talking about industry or are we talking about something else? The way I see it, we’re in a perfect spot to develop more cropland and rely less on California. The challenge is those things don’t necessarily fit in a box of the questions you asked.
I’m continuously reminded about the City of Wichita’s ordinance in regards to chickens and the fact that you could not keep a chicken which crowed inside the city (aka, no roosters).

Is that gender discrimination?

My sister had chickens in her backyard for a zillion years, and she was pleasantly surprised when they also turned out to be a source of eggs! When you look at small areas, areas that want natural food, eggs are the first way that always shows up.

We have to think about our natural resources. We bring a bunch of industry to create jobs and ruin the aquifer and the farmland.

I’ve been here all my life.

I’m working on it.

I said edge because I thought, through utilities, it would just be easier to be able to extend versus starting out in the middle of nowhere. I know trying to bring water to my property would be expensive, not that I want to, but just to know my options. I bought rural acreage because I love being in a small community. I think the balance of growth is really important. It seems like in the southeast part of the county, there’s a lot of local farmers and that was a big attraction to me that the county really supported it, like the Kaw Valley Farm Tour, and that really attracted me to that area because it was like my neighbor who owns the property and I want to support them.

The only thing when you start looking at cities and peripheral areas to the cities, it’s so much easier to do sanitary sewers, which for most of us who live in the county, we have adequate septic tanks. You get intense growth and that becomes absolutely unworkable.

I’ll be pulling water when I build a home from a well and my concern is the bottoms of the Kaw and if I have any industry down there that could potentially damage or pollute the water. In that area, you don’t have the option to have city water, everybody pulls from a well.

Do you favor a policy that encourages the majority of new growth towards city boundaries and preserves farmlands? Why or why not?

I think that’s a natural — a business is gonna come out and need sewers and urban water, they’re not gonna go out in the middle of 160 acres, 40 miles from some place.

Unless you’re Tyson.
Yes, the logical answer is yes, of course, because that’s where growth should occur. Look at Leavenworth and Lansing and think of the amount of infill growth that could occur in both those cities without encroaching on traditionally agricultural land and where people want to live without hearing sirens.

I echo what he said. It’s more cost effective for utilities and infrastructure is the main reason I support that.

- **Would you support a minimum 20-acre zoning district in rural areas to protect farmland? Why or why not?**

  I would probably be against that because you’re breaking it down to only a very few people who could build in the country. Most people can’t buy 20 acres and put a house on it, and you’re limiting the amount of growth you can get. That’s a pretty good-sized parcel. The house over on Kansas Avenue and that road that goes into Bonner, there’s $1.6 million on 12 and half acres. You couldn’t even build *that* house. And they only have 12 and a half. My understanding is there’s more land you could buy with it, but that land is slated for development.

  There aren’t very many people that want 20 acres. That’s a lot of work. 10 is enough. Three to five acres you can have a nice-sized yard and can keep things under control. Most of those people work in the city.

  But you’re back to the question of, at that point, what happens with sanitary sewers for the property, depending upon where you are? In this county, 10 is the minimum you can have and have an adequate septic system to go with it. I’m in favor of a minimum size, but 20 is larger than I think it ought to be.

I’m curious, is this strictly agriculture?

Yes.

Is it 20 now?

No it’s 5 acres now.

Would anybody argue for 20?

I would. Simply because a lot of us have been here for a long time. When I moved here in 1947, there were only five families around there. I can speak for the majority of people that live around me that we don’t want to see this spot development and land chopped up into little pieces because it destroys our rural setting. Which is specified in the state statute; they want a certain amount of rural atmosphere. The island annexations around Basehor I think were a big mistake. I’m hoping it doesn’t continue. But people are still buying parcels of farm intending to chop it up. We need to protect the farmland.
Maybe you have a family farm that’s 50 acres and you want to split that off for your children, and there just isn’t enough land to make 20-acre parcels and split that up if you have a few kids. I don’t know if that would be a unique situation.

Well, does the zoning distinguish between rural residential and agricultural? If you’re in an agricultural zoned area where there will be people living, what is the difference between the two?

JJ: Currently we don’t have a zoning for agricultural, it’s just appraisers. We have rural residential 5 acres, closer to cities it’s a minimum of 2.5 acres, but towards the north it’s 5 acres again.

FACILITATOR: If 20 is too big, what’s a realistic minimum?

5

I would go with 5

5

If that’s in the very rural part of the county.

It should expand like it is right now. In the city, it’s 2.5.

I have a question, on our side of 155th it’s 5 and on the east side it’s 2.5, how did that end up being zoned?

JJ: I don’t know, that happened a long time ago.

Same way Carolyn did, she went to the county commissioners and got it accomplished. Richard and I live in the same neighborhood and across the street it’s 2.5 acres, and they’re spaghetti lots, long and skinny, they’re really not appropriate, they really ought to be double their size.

Should the county adopt policies to encourage residential growth in the unincorporated areas into planned subdivisions? Why or why not?

What’s a minimum lot size there?

A planned subdivision?

JJ: 2.5 acres or smaller size. It could be 1 acre.

FACILITATOR: More like residential neighborhoods.

Theoretically, from the perspective of ultimately wanting to see Leavenworth County grow and prosper, my response is yes, but my personal response is not just
no, but hell no. You’ve got existing cities, one city in the county that has chosen to do island annexation, and it was a terrible idea. No, if you’re gonna do it, concentrate around the areas that already have development, where you could logically extend utilities rather than trying to encourage someone to come in, jump over 3 or 4 miles of existing property to create a subdivision. Terrible idea.

- That’s true.

- I think one thing to keep in mind if you’re expecting the city to do utilities is they won’t unless you’re in city limits.

- Makes sense.

- Encourage development in unincorporated areas, that’s a big statement. There are a lot of unincorporated areas, so is that a wide-open question or are we thinking about specific areas?

- I think they should allow it. It’s the right of the owners if they want to invest and do it, there are a number in our county that aren’t bad for our county. They have higher-value houses. Ten acres is too much, it’s hard to maintain 10 acres or even 5 acres. There are many 2.5-acre developments that have increased our taxable value and none of them are blighted.

- How do you get services out to them?

- That would be the developer’s responsibility. If they’re willing to spend the money and build half-a-million-dollar homes.

- Using that proposed development in front of us, I don’t know who pays for the sewer that runs in front of my property, who pays? I don’t need sewer and I have my own water. That’s a lot of the big objections in my community.

- You’re in an area that’s trying to growth-manage. You’re on a main road and you have a lot of concerns that if the district comes in for sewer, you could get caught up in it and it would feel unfair to you.

- As near as I can tell, the deal was made before surrounding landowners were made aware of it. Now we have a power play with whoever’s the developer right now and we just don’t want that kind of a situation in our neighborhood.

- Should new rural residential subdivisions close to a city be required to meet the city’s design standards?

- Absolutely not. I moved out here and I have one person I can vote for in the county of Leavenworth, one commissioner, but I have Basehor telling me what I can and can’t do with my property. I have no representation whatsoever. I got to the
planning department and they tell me to talk to city manager of Basehor. I have no representation. We fought a war over this stuff. I know that it’s a Kansas law, that doesn’t mean it shouldn’t be changed.

Do you live outside Basehor?

I’m within a mile of Honey Creek, so I’m within the urban growth strangulation area.

I’m in that same area and if I want to do something, I’m gonna do it.

I agree, especially if they can’t provide services.

For existing properties, I don’t think the city should tell us what to do with our properties, but new growth, I could see that needing certain standards.

Yeah, and just quality of construction needs to be taken into account.

But you realize Leavenworth County doesn’t even have a building code?

FACILITATOR: That’s next on my agenda to discuss.

I mean that’s a problem right? I feel like if I’m buying a house my expectation is, it’s going to meet certain standards. Where do you draw the line?

FACILITATOR: This is for a planned subdivision close to a city.

So if the city has a traditional design standard?

Tell me a city that has design standards.

I don’t think so.

I’ve never seen them in a municipality.

I grew up in Michigan and there’s a town with design standards and expectations for people, you have to have petunias next to the mailbox.

JJ: In this case we’re talking about the streets, the cities have urban gutter streets, sidewalks, lighting, etc.

No.

No.

No, if it’s not part of the city my answer is no.
• Should Leavenworth County adopt building codes for new structures built in unincorporated areas? Why or why not?
  o Yes.
  o Absolutely.
  o Yes.
  o It should be strictly focused on the workmanship. That's necessary.
  o It's to protect everybody.
  o We need a uniform building code.
  o FACILITATOR: Anyone against it?
    o Generally speaking yes, for a house yes. If I'm building me a little chicken coop, I don't think I need to spend $3,000 extra to meet a building code. There needs to be some criteria around what requires building codes

• If the county adopts a building code program, who should pay for the administrative and inspection costs? The property owner, the county, or a combination?
  o Combination.
  o Combination.
  o Combination.
  o Combination.

• Should the County allow the cities to enforce building codes outside of their city limits, but within a certain distance of the city?
  o No.
  o No.
  o No.
  o Like I said, if it's not part of the city they shouldn't have to obey city codes.
  o They're sure doing it.
• **Should commercial development continue to operate in the unincorporated areas of the county through special use permits? Why or why not?**

  o No, leave things alone and quit trying to force this down people’s throats. I’m firmly against any kind of commercial development. No. I’m against that. Just on general principal.

  o I think that question is more nuanced than it appears. If I want to come in and open a business on Highway 1 building concrete statues, quite frankly that property needs to be zoned to be able to do that, that’s not a special use permit. If I want to run my brokerage business out of my basement, I’m not gonna rezone the property to do that. A special use permit should be more than sufficient. Therefore I think it depends.

  o **FACILITATOR: To do commercial-zoned work?**

  o I think there’s a lot of considerations for that. If I were to talk about the stuff that’s going in for the quarry, a lot of rural residential people surround that area, and if you were to follow the golden list, which is the criteria that Planning and Zoning have to go through, I could answer the first 5 for why something like that shouldn’t be in that area. It’s a main corridor to K-10, there’s a lot of residents and movement in that area. It really depends. There’s a lot of factors that need to be considered and I think the state has a list.

  o If there’s business that wants to go somewhere and it’s not zoned where it is, there needs to be a process of some kind for that consideration. If it’s not the sand quarry, let’s say it’s a nice business about sustainable agriculture, something that isn’t intrusive to the land, but people aren’t necessarily opposed to that kind of a business so it’s back to looking at, what is the business, what do they want to do? What is the process and is it fair? Who’s making the decisions? Is the state? County Planning and Zoning? Commissioners? There’s a lot of factors. Again, I have a hard time just saying throw out the process. There are going to be times we want some kind of a commercial business to come in.

• **Should the county have its own parks department and provide parks services in unincorporated areas of the county?**

  o I say yes. We are underutilizing our beautiful resources. There’s a lot of opportunity there and we did hear it in the visioning meeting. There is no plan that I’m aware of where we get to that. It’s like cities have some parks, we have a state fishing lake. But no county parks. I’m not sure how we get there without some kind of a Parks and Rec department to manage it.

  o At that meeting a lot of people did mention parks and I was curious to find out whether those people are in the county or currently in the city and complaining about the city? That can be confusing because we don’t know who said it and what
we’re really talking about. What do you want? Growth? Dog parks? We’re not defining what these things are. We have no idea. If I live in Tonganoxie, and I put that I want more parks and trails, am I saying I want more in Tonganoxie?

- Yes, we have lots of fabulous areas in this county. There’s spectacular scenery from the north end to the south end.
- For this discussion, yeah, we probably need on a countywide level some group of people that says, “We’re parks planning.” We need to at least look at the planning part of the process. Where could the county theoretically have park areas, exactly how many landowners will be bent out of shape talking about that? Planning needs to happen before implementation.
- City parks are great for walking trails and a picnic but for those of us who like to hunt and camp and do those things, we’re pretty much going outside the county. If you want a public place where you can pitch your tent. What do people really want and need? It’s the trend nowadays, but we don’t have those kinds of things in Leavenworth County.
- And if we did have a county park that had gazebos or shelters that could be rented, there’s income that could be made. Think of all the music concerts in DeSoto. There’s not much there, it’s just a big field, but they have a lot of things going on. There’s no reason we couldn’t have something like that here. There’s a lot of races and bicycle races and marathons that could be hosted through a county park which produces income which would be self-supporting or at least as much as it could be.

- Does the state offer money for county parks?
  - FACILITATOR: I’d be shocked in the current climate.
  - Kansas Parks and Recreation income is down because of the flooding within the areas they use to generate income.
  - FACILITATOR: You never know in the future.

- If we were to start a county parks department, how should a parks department be funded? General fund? Countywide sales tax? Developer fees? Some combination?
  - General fund (two votes)
  - A combination of sources (nine votes)
  - It’s Parks and Rec. You’re not developing it for profit.
  - With development fees you’re talking about businesses, development of planned subdivisions, they create the rooftops for the parks, the developer could get some
building fees or some of the fees could go towards that. Along with the general fund of the county. I know the planning and zoning department would want to donate their salary to the parks.

- I think multiple sources as well because the revenue generated off camping spots — you look at parks services other counties provide, they have classes coming in and they’re getting a fee for a kid attending a class. I would almost bet money there are grants of certain kinds that could be applied for to help fund that. To preserve our lands and put them to good use. I’d look at that as a revenue source.

- I’ve never thought about general fund versus sales tax and I’m not gonna decide before we’ve discussed it.

- If you look at what Prairie Village did with the old golf course, the developer came in, bought all the land, came to the city and said we wanna do this and the city said, “No, if you really want to do this, you can take 40% and use it for your residential development and you can give the other 60% to use as a park, and we’ll pay you for it.” If the county is looking at leapfrog subdivisions, I think it’s probably a legitimate place to go to that same developer, and say, “Oh, by the way, you need to set aside XYZ amount of land for public park space and deed that land to Leavenworth County Parks and Rec Department.”

- Development should have a minimum amount of green space.

- Green space should be used by all county residents.

- What other concerns do you have about land use/zoning in unincorporated areas of the county?

- I’d like to hear how we’re gonna stop Basehor from taking over the southern area of the county.

- I’m not really up to speed on this, but as we think about the price of everything going up, housing and all that, I’ve heard talk that there are some communities and a school of thought that you get to the point where you have some small housing community sharing certain things. I know that’s kind of futuristic. We’re here and now thinking about us, but what’s gonna be the need 30 years down the road? Will our grandchildren want to live in farming communities? Are they gonna be back-to-the-basics kind of people? Those are the things that I think about. What does that look like down the road? Is it ok to put a tiny house on your property, do you have a couple tiny houses where you have, not a commune, but a family environment? Are we setting ourselves up for the future or are we putting ourselves in a box?

- It was touched on throughout the whole meeting—the owners have a specific right and there’s been talk of agricultural zoning, I think by labeling a farmer’s ground ag preserve. It’s a disservice to them, if you’re taking ground that they bought and
you're making it smaller and devaluing their property. I think we need to be careful of that. We need to allow owners to do what they can within reason.

- The premise of reverse condemnation.

- Could I ask a question? What's the difference between this meeting and meeting at 4 o'clock?

  - FACILITATOR: Some will be the same and some will be different. We'll be focusing on growth areas.

- Can you explain to me what island annexation is?

  - KV: It's leapfrogging. Instead of expanding current city boundaries, it's going out and getting a piece that's not a continuous area of a city.

- Basehor's a good example of it.

- If you're within one mile of Basehor then urban growth takes over and Basehor can tell you what you can do.

- So the city's annexing these developments?

  - Yes.

  - FACILITATOR: In those cases the property owners are requesting it?

  - Krystal Voth: Yes, they have to be on board.

  - FACILITATOR: They're asking to be annexed in to get sewer or water.

  - But the reality of that is, you're skipping over areas so you're in essence governing them when they have no ability to be represented.

  - FACILITATOR: If you're annexed, you're within city limits.

  - Island annexation creates an area between it where suddenly you're inside the urban growth area.

  - Krystal Voth: That area has to come from the contiguous city, so it can't come from the island. That's what the state statute says. It has to come from a contiguous portion of city limits.

  - That's not what they're telling me about my land.

  - The county's pushing that so that the cities can make those decisions, versus letting the people who are in the county be part of the county. The county doesn't want
these small lots. They’re pushing for 5 to 10 acre lots. You definitely need to be coming to these meetings because they’re pushing the boundary of the cities.

- Let’s take the example of Overland Park that has turned into the colossus of Kansas, but if I remember, the majority of the development has been contiguous. They have not engaged in island annexation.

- Kansas City, Missouri did, though.

- Personally I think it’s a horrible idea.

- I think Overland Park did do it that way, but they also built the infrastructure and took it in as they built it, whereas I don’t know any city that’s currently expanding infrastructure to expanding borders.

- What do you mean by infrastructure?

- Water and sewer.
Urban Growth Focus Group South
Participants: 20

- **Are you excited that Leavenworth County continues to grow in population? Why or why not?**
  - I’m excited. I just think it’s a good thing. When I came to Tonganoxie there were 800 people in town and I thought it was great then because I was 12, but I like it better now.
  - The city growth I’m ok with, the county growth is a little annoying. Just because I like the space on our farm. But I understand why it’s changing and why people are moving here. It’s part of a growing county, and I accept that, but it’s frustrating sometimes to see a new roof pop up.
  - As a person who came here 15 years ago, I think it’s kind of inevitable because of location. We’re close to KC, close to Lawrence, close to Topeka, I think it’s inevitable and we need to plan for it and deal with it.

- **Where do you think future growth should occur within the county? Raise your hands as I read through these multiple-choice options.**
  - Within cities — 13
  - On the edge of existing cities — 13
  - Undeveloped rural areas — 2
  - Along County Road 1 — 8
  - Not sure — 1
  - I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County — 0

- **Why did you answer the way you did?**
  - It has to be balanced across the county. There are parts of cities that need growth, and probably replacement, and then you need to go on the periphery and cities need room to grow and you need some development out in the county.
  - I’d like to see contiguous growth, not island annexation that moves with city boundaries.
I like that, too. On the edge of the cities and go out. One of the problems we have is not having another north/south route and we have all these developments in the counties where somebody’s going to get hurt as you grow there.

I’d like to see commercial limited to those areas where we’re specifically targeting it, like County Road 1 and 24/40. I just don’t like the idea of trying to see commercial growth occurring in what has traditionally been rural residential areas.

But if it’s currently zoned for commercial or industrial, that’s ok?

Yes. I assume that the zoning designations we’ve got were done with some foresight.

Why was that road listed specifically in your question, but not 24/40?

Rewrite the question. Add “along major highways and arterials.”

I like that.

What concerns do you have about growth in the county?

Inadequate roads.

Unprepared infrastructure, turning lanes. I’m surprised there aren’t more accidents, when you slow down to turn. If people knew how to use the shoulders correctly, we’d save a lot of stress on our roads.

Inadequate utilities in general. Water, sewer, telecom, internet.

I would like to see it be planned growth and that’s with the Leavenworth County planning organization, and developing some ordinances to define what’s expected and what’s not expected. That’s what we do in the cities, we have ordinances that require this and that and it’s kind of semi-planned and they have to go before a planning commission.

FACILITATOR: That’s what we’re working towards with this plan.

Access to services like ambulance, fire, making sure that’s kept up with.

Are there areas in the county in that direction that are kind of short on services? Like grocery stores or schools?

I think one of the things is flexibility in the plan, because not everything’s going to fall in one category. It needs to handle different situations in a common-sense way.
That would be nice as long as we don’t say, “Yes, you can do it” to one family and “No, you can’t” to another. We have to have some kind of standard by which we are going to continue to work.

Are you trying to limit the special use permit? That’s how they add commercial growth.

I want to say one thing more. I remember when 435 was built way out here there wasn’t much close to it and there wasn’t much for the first 2 or 3 years, so when we’re talking about a corridor maybe it should go further out than just Tonganoxie. Some of these other development and services might follow along out there.

As a follow-up to his statement about different applications of the plan to different parts of county, not for individual property but areas. One suitable for commercial, one for residential. Others in keeping with other parts of the county like urban or country. That would be the difference as I see it.

In regard to unincorporated areas not governed by a city, should Leavenworth County control what type of new development occurs (residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.)?

Absolutely, but you do that through zoning.

I would agree. I think it’s imperative that the county control it. What’s the alternative? Another governing body like landowners? For proper growth it needs to be governed by the county, not the city or anyone else.

What was the alternative to that question?

Sounds like the urban growth plan of Basehor.

What type of new development?

Yes.

It’s in the county, it should be controlled by the county.

Right.

No disagreement.
In regard to unincorporated areas not governed by a city, should Leavenworth County control where new development occurs (residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.)?

- Yes.
- In good governance between cities and the county for future planning of annexation if that’s something property owners want.
- Growth doesn’t always happen the way you plan it. You don’t always get something where you think it’s gonna go. The plan has to be flexible to change with where the development is gonna go. Nobody thought Legends was gonna be there 30 years ago, and it’s been great for us. We don’t have to deal with it, and it’s over there. Sometimes where the money goes is where the development is gonna happen at. Sometimes the plan needs to change to allow for things to happen. I think we’ve seen developments shut down because it’s not in the right place in the county, so they’ve drawn a red line, but the guy ends up having it in another area so that development doesn’t take place in our county because the county says you can’t do it over there. It has to be amendable.
- I would think that as you develop a plan, you develop it with some idea of what’s already in progress and what’s going on so after you’ve got your plan developed, you’re even going to modify it as something else might come in. Like if we want to do something but it’s not in the area you want it to be, so you have to modify the plan for it.
- FACILITATOR: Plans should always be revisited. Nobody has a crystal ball.
- It ought to be forward-looking. Very forward-looking in anticipation that something could happen sometime. You can’t let uncontrolled development override what should be there. Highway 7 and I-70, somebody could not have anticipated we’d need a cloverleaf on that section, so now we have several businesses and that corner has been cut off and they did something out west and brought it back around and that’s less than optimal design for that intersection. You need to perhaps go ahead and zone or set aside some critical areas for future development. Might not happen, but if they’d zoned that 35 years ago and said “no development on those four corners,” we’d have had a much better traffic flow than what we have.
- That same intersection caused a problem when they made that change. Now there’s a no-left-turn sign, when I remember you could left-turn before.
- That’s because people were holding up traffic southbound on 7 because it was holding up traffic on 70.
You still have a green light to go west.

I don’t go that way.

You can go west, but you can’t go left.

It formerly backed it up on I-70.

It still does.

**What type of new development should be encouraged for Leavenworth County? Raise your hands as I read through options.**

- Industrial — 8
- Residential — 6
- Commercial — 3
- Mixed-use — 3
- Other — 2 (all the above)

**Why did you answer the way you did?**

- All of them.
  - I’m gonna vote for residential as the top priority. I want more rooftops in Basehor, so I could have a commercial grocery store.
  - I’d say industrial.
  - Depends on the industrial we’re talking about.
  - We don’t want that debacle again, but we need some light industry to offset the tax base and create primary jobs.
  - I agree with all that, but I think when I hear people talk about this north and south road and the debate, why don’t they find out where they’re going to put this road before everybody goes out there and builds a house and then they have a big hassle?
  - You can’t build a road through a vacant area, you have to have something leading to the road.
  - The Patriot Highway is what it was. When it was drawn up on a napkin at IHOP originally, it did avoid a lot of the farms and houses
that are out there. But in between that time a lot of houses have been put up.

- 2017 was the first reference I found to it.

- The problem for me is, if we had had a plan before, we could have designated a proposed highway for 2020 and then you could have set that aside and negotiated with the landowners and said, "This is where we'd like to see this in the future."

- I think it kind of depends, too, what area you're currently in, because when I buy groceries, I'm not buying them in Leavenworth County, I'm going to Wyandotte County. But I live in Basehor, so that's the need in my area. It'd be nice to have commercial business of some kind.

- What's the disadvantage of multi-use apartments and eating establishments in one location? It's kind of a 20/20 vision for the future. Building up and not out. I don't know though, because if you build up, you're still gonna have people there that need grocery stores.

- **FACILITATOR**: Mixed-used development, you think of more in cities.

- What Lenexa is doing with their mixed-used city center.

- What you just said kind of defeated what I was thinking that that's something the cities do; the county plan has to include the cities. Otherwise we're going to put an industrial side over there, but the cities want industrial side over here. I think you gotta work together. The city is planning, and the county is planning. It's gotta be the total county, not just the county and cities are left out. It has to be inclusive.

- That brings up something else. Most cities have some kind of comprehensive plan. Besides presenting them to the county, they should not get approval, they should go and let the county see where they are in the development, especially since we have the up to the three-mile zone that can be developed. Otherwise, you have a big disconnect again. If they would be included, they should all sit down and look at it together, not for critical reasons but at least to coordinate.

- **FACILITATOR**: Olsson will be looking at all the existing plans that are in place. We don't want to recreate the wheel.

- I think we need to have a diversified tax base in the county. We don't have enough business, be it commercial or industrial, so if the county's going to be spending money to develop, they ought to be focusing their attention on some type of light industry because that
brings more jobs, more rooftops, and more commercial. That's what the county needs to focus on.

- I agree with this gent. I know 72 cents of every tax dollar generated comes from homeowners. That's the highest in any Kansas county. There's gotta be communication between cities and the county. If a person wants to develop an adjoining property that's in the county, is the county gonna be responsible for water lines, sewers? Whose standards is it gonna be done by?

- I'm not saying the county needs to take care of those things, I think that's where the cooperation between city and county comes together. As far as trying to drive development, that should be the county's focus.

- You're not gonna have the industrial sector develop anything without residential and commercial. You've gotta have people there so I don't see how you can come up with an answer to this because it has to be everything.

- FACILITATOR: It will all happen as we grow, we just want to know what should be the priority.

- Should Leavenworth County adopt building codes for new dwelling units and commercial structures built in unincorporated areas within the urban growth district? Why or why not?
  - Yes.
  - Yes.
  - Because in a rural setting such as ours where an individual house is built there are different criteria than the stringent building codes in the city.
  - It's kind of a loaded question.
  - Should be consistent throughout the county.
  - But should it have to match the city?
  - If it matches the city it's adjoined to, which group of people is setting those standards? The landowner has no ability to vote for that if they're out in the county.
  - They adopt the national construction codes and it's the same. It's not, “Go out here to Tonganoxie and have one code and a different one in Linwood.” There's one and it applies to everybody.
I suspect if the county would adopt a code that the cities would adopt a similar code, if not the same.

It's the chicken and the egg again.

Depends on what city.

City already has a code and the county does not.

Leavenworth County has no code.

Repeat your question please.

FACILITATOR: [repeats the question]

It's in the county, the county should control it.

The urban growth district is 3 miles.

If the city codes don’t apply to that 3-mile thing, then you’re right.

To parallel these comments, as long as the government body is the county and not the city of which you’re not a constituent, sure. So if the county is doing it but not the city, it’s a problem.

But you can vote for a county commissioner?

I can’t vote for the city commissioner.

It’s necessary to get a permit.

Why shouldn’t everyone who gets that permit have to follow the same building code?

There’s no county code?

I thought they did have a code.

Just for septic tanks.

Oh, my.

Are you gonna ask about property standards? We talked about building codes. So what about junk cars and things that kind of degrade the property? It’s not design standards, it’s upkeep. Cities expect certain things of your yard. I think when we start talking about urban growth, those are some of the things that will come into play. Not just building codes, that is, do we want
the cities controlling that in the urban growth area or is that a county issue?

- Apparently there are no standards.
- Anybody could start a junkyard.
- *Jeff Joseph: No, we have enforcement for that, but no property maintenance standards like grass cutting.*
- Let me ask you this: Can someone live in a camper?
- *JJ: Not right now.*
- Well, they’re doing it!

- If the county adopts a building code program, who should pay for the administrative and inspection costs? Developers? Taxpayers? Some combination?

  - Who pays for it in the cities?
    - By the taxpayer.
    - That’s who you’re hiring, the city inspector, with taxpayers’ money. Some of it is permit fees, but not all of it.
    - So it’s combination.
    - I think if it’s a new business enterprise set to benefit a small group of people, then maybe along with the risk should go the payment for the codes so perhaps it should be on the developer. It’s a new venture, it’s a risk, why should the taxpayer have to subsidize that?
    - It becomes a benefit district. If you run sewer for a small business, you agree with the developer to run it, and there’s three houses across the street, they become a part of the benefit district of the sewer and so they get charged a fee on their taxes whether they use it or not.
    - One of my ideas — because there aren’t codes in the county — is that they’ve divided districts up with county commissioners, so why don’t they do that with inspectors? So the city inspector from Tonganoxie would inspect the building and house from Tonganoxie. So the city’s inspector would do that, rather than the county and a whole new group of people to do this. It’s not like it’s not a benefit for people. I think we need to have codes. My group of builders build to Johnson County code because that’s what cities have
adopted. We don’t mind people coming over and taking a look at it. We want that.

- So you are in favor of the cities doing the inspection?

- I hate hiring another person at the county level that we have to pay. The people are already in the cities. Tonganoxie has one and Linwood has one. There’s one in Basehor, Lansing. They would go out to those areas how they’re broken up by county commissioners. That way we don’t have to hire a whole new group of county people. The city benefits.

  - *JJ: They don’t have enough people to do that. They have one inspector.*

- We don’t have that much building in the county, Jeff. They could do it. We’re building 150 homes in Basehor. And how many homes are built out in the county in Basehor?

  - *JJ: We already checked with the cities, and they don’t have the personnel to do it.*

- Who inspects the inspectors?

- All things are possible, we just have to figure out how to do it.

- **Should Leavenworth County promote denser development in urban growth management areas?**

  - Denser than what?

  - *FACILITATOR: Denser than today.*

  - Depends on the area.

  - Like multi-family, are you talking apartments?

  - More houses on every acre is what they’re saying.


  - I think it needs to be along a thoroughfare. I don’t think you need an apartment complex out in the country.

  - Some of the reason people moved out here is to be on larger lots. That’s why they came to Tonganoxie and Basehor. The county and cities are trying to say, “We don’t want that larger lot. We want smaller lots that are easier to manage.” Want to take away the variety.
I don’t think building an apartment complex takes away variety. Still have a large lot owner and a small lot owner.

But a house on a 2.5- and 5-acre parcel?

But what if a person has a 2-acre parcel and wants to develop it?

But they can do that?

No they can’t. There’s regulations already in place to keep that from happening. Should they promote it to be smaller? That’s what they’re saying. That’s not why people move out here. They move out here for the land.

If most of the infrastructure has come with cities, then you’ve got to consolidate some in that area to be denser.

Agreed.

That area needs to be identified through zoning and needs to be done early. “Here we want three houses per acre, out here it’s two.”

Mixed opportunities to have smaller apartment houses and more residential single-family and blended.

Should be by area.

Shouldn’t have four houses per acre where you’ve got 2.5 acre lots.

What that entire question doesn’t address though is the reality of when we’re talking about a county planning process, I have the wherewithal to be able to live where I live—not everybody does. There are needs for duplexes and multi-family houses throughout the county for something less than a single-family dwelling on 10 acres. You have to look at the whole spectrum of economic factors that you’re dealing with.

A lot of people move into those duplexes or multi-family units and then purchase and go upgrade and upgrade again so you have to have that available to them.

It’s the whole moving up and moving back down eventually.

I live in the city in a 2.5-acre lot, and I’d love to have a quarter acre lot in town.

After you’ve lived on that 10-acre lot, you realize you don’t really want 10 acres.
Multi-use, like some of the things that we’re seeing in Lenexa, where it is denser but there’s a variety of things available. Our younger generation is looking for things like that.

The new generation coming up, they are joiners. They want to join things that are diverse. And the only way you’re gonna get a diverse population is if you have multi-use, recreational, coffee shops, sandwich shops, with living units across the street. Multi-setting. That’s the younger generation, if you want them to come and you want their buying power.

FACILITATOR: A lot of small towns in Kansas are developing second floors on their main street into cool lofts because that’s where people want to live.

Perhaps it should be done on lower property value areas in the city limits, revitalizing old red brick buildings on main streets.

Downtown Leavenworth.

I hate hearing about the idea of parts of the county not within cities being developed in multi-use. That’s not what we buy out in those areas for.

How important is it to you for the county to actively preserve nature areas such as woodlands, streams, lakes, and scenic views in the urban growth boundary?

Very important. One of the reasons is the rain runoff. If we don’t have green spaces in between, if we continue to get 5-inch rainfalls in two hours and so many concrete streets, we’ll be in trouble. We need it for those reasons, besides just the aesthetics.

To piggyback on that, only for the ecologically appropriate runoff and cleanliness of the county. Not necessarily something that the county needs to make a park of, but just simply to allow natural ecology of the county.

I’d like to hear from the younger people in the group. They are the ones who are going to be living here. Are they more interested in parks? That came out a lot at our visioning event.

Ok, token younger people.

I’ll speak from the middle-aged group, I think they’re important for several reasons. Like this big sidewalk outside Tonganoxie that goes to nowhere. I thought that was stupid but now I see people on that constantly. It’s used. When I think about areas in the county like for park areas, there’s the lake, which is not well-kept.

Woefully underused. A quarry that’s basically an industrial zone.
But what other parks are there?

There aren’t any.

Nothing.

We’ve got streambeds that flood up and down the county that should have some kind of walking trails, development along either side.

No, we should do rails to trails. I own the train depot in town and a trail from Leavenworth to Lawrence would be amazing. All the people coming through there instead of dodging them on County Road 1.

I said last time comparing it to Lawrence off K-10, they did all that wildlife preserve out there. I think parks and trails would be great, but think about how horrible that looks with dead animals along there.

I think that’s gorgeous. On the north side of K-10 that was forced to be preserved, is absolutely gorgeous.

The issue is they’re promoting the animals to come live in that small area and they have to cross the roads.

There are some solutions to it besides erecting a fast road across it.

I wonder how that affected private property rights among the folks on that area. If the county was preserving land, would that include annexation of areas where you have someone walking up and down along private land?

I think that’s a phony argument, quite frankly, from the perspective that there are have been rails to trails developments throughout this nation that have been highly commercially developable, not had any of the, “Oh, my god, you’re bringing crime and degradation to the edge of my property.” I think it’s an argument that everyone who wants to beat the drum for private property makes.

I’ve been to areas of Johnson County with trail systems with very high-value property in those areas and who knows who’s passing your property all day?

I think rails to trails is a great idea but those that have been done were done when the lines were abandoned. Our lines were abandoned 50 years ago.

I think it’s a good idea to do this in new developments. I think we’re doing more and more of those dedicated green spaces, we’re open to do it. The younger generation is wanting it. That’s what Millennials want to do. Not just them, it’s all of us, getting out and walking more.
I enjoy the lake, I’ve got five kids, we go out there, it’s beautiful, it’s quiet. What draws a lot of younger people here like myself—I grew up in Basehor, went to work in the city and came back and my idea was to come back and create a park for myself. Have the kids running around in the same creeks and fields that I did when I grew up. That was very attractive to me. Those who have the opportunity to build their own park.

Not everybody has that opportunity.

That’s why I didn’t say anything because I grew up on a farm, so I don’t know what it’s like to not have space. If I did live in the city, I’d want parks and trails, but I don’t want it coming through my backyard.

**What other concerns or ideas about urban growth do you have?**

As urban growth occurs, I see lots of people see the creeks running out there and that’s great. I think the cities ought to be controlling the runoff because people are building too close to these creeks. They need to establish a 100-year flood plain.

They already have that.

These all need to be in the plan. Until you start developing it, you don’t have to work at that.

**FACILITATOR: Flood maps will be pulled for the plan.**

I have a question about the three-mile diameter of the city, I’ve never gotten an answer. Is there a pinpoint, in the middle of Basehor? The edge of Basehor? Part of the main metropolitan area? What is that? That’s not an equal distance either. It’s not like you can draw a three-mile circle on the city.

If you live in Basehor, you’re three miles from the urban boundary.

I like that too.

So it’s not three miles from Falcon Lakes? It’s from the main city limits.

Where the city limits are now.

Excluding Falcon Lakes? Because it’s an island development.

Field of Dreams? Has that been annexed by county?

I think so.

Another island development.
The one thing I was interested in... 10-15 years ago Basehor took one direction, Tonganoxie took another, Basehor went higher-end and Tonganoxie went more the $200,000 houses. I don’t know why they went those two different directions. I don’t know if that has a place here on which kind of house we’re building in these areas. How much we spend. I know Dan did a lot of them.

Being married to a realtor, it's pretty obvious that's a market-driven thing. A $400,000 to $500,000 house in Leavenworth County is hard to sell. It can be done, but it’s tough. That’s one of the problems Pinehurst Estates has south of Basehor. You’re looking at $400,000 houses for what? You get no amenities and not everybody is willing to spend that without green space.

Higher end versus lower end? Is it all market driven?

Most of the stuff in the county is high-end 'cause of land.

But there are all these duplexes out here and single family too.

From what I read on those, homeowners association and mowing are taking place in those.

There’s a group I’m trying to get to come here. They don’t want to mow grass, they don’t want to do any of that stuff.

It's free enterprise versus government control.

Millennials and old folks don’t want to mow the grass.

How do we keep the kids in our county?

I still want a Texas Roadhouse in Leavenworth County.

We have great schools, great families, our kids graduate, and we send them to college—how do we get them back?

How do we have jobs?

For the same reason you came back. You came back for that little piece of land.

I didn’t come back for a job, I came back for the land.
Question-by-Question Analysis

Overview

County residents were surveyed about their priorities for the county and their positions on several key issues. The survey opened on Tuesday, May 28, and closed on Tuesday, September 3. During this survey period, 2,124 respondents completed the survey.

The survey was promoted through local media, the county’s website, and Facebook. Because it was an online opt-in survey with a printed version on request, rather than one distributed by mail or phone to a random sampling of every household in the county, its data provides general indications and trends in residents’ opinions, but cannot be taken as a scientific sampling of households.

In this report, overall findings are provided for each question. Then, to get a richer understanding of the data, each question is queried against respondents’ responses to four different demographic questions:

- **By type of residential location**
  Responses were subdivided for each question into three groups — respondents living within a city’s limits, living in the urban growth areas (three miles of a city), and living in rural, unincorporated areas — to see how the answers of each group were similar or different.

- **By city**
  All respondents chose a city they either lived in or affiliated with because it was the closest to their home. Seven cities — Leavenworth, Lansing, Tonganoxie, Basehor, Linwood, Bonner Springs, and Easton — had significant numbers of respondents, which allowed analysis of how each city’s group answered each question to determine trends.

- **By age**
  The 1,915 respondents who answered question 16 about their age allowed a breakdown of the total responses for each question by age group and look for insights about Leavenworth County residents. This enabled some conclusions throughout this report as to how people of different age groups felt about each question.

- **By length of residence**
  Finally, it was desired to see whether people who were new to Leavenworth County answered the questions differently from those who have lived in the county a longer period. For some questions, this was insightful information, and for others, length of residence seemed to have little impact on the results.

How Have Opinions Evolved? 2007 vs. 2019

In 2007, as the county prepared its previous Leavenworth County Comprehensive Plan, two surveys were conducted:

- **The first was a paper-based survey** handed out to residents and non-residents at various meetings and events, or emailed on request. It contained 18 questions on a variety of general topics in the county. About 600 residents completed this survey.

  For our online survey in 2019, we asked many of the same or similar questions of our 2,124 respondents. Throughout this report, we’ll highlight areas where there has been significant change in how the questions were answered, either because opinions have changed or county demographics and cities have changed over the past 12 years. Look for this icon to help spot comparisons between the 2007 and 2019 data.

- **A second, more detailed paper survey** was conducted of the planning committee and taskforce members, and any participants who included their contact information on the first survey. About 80 people completed this survey.
Q1. I am interested in Leavenworth County because I… (Check all that apply)

Overall
The majority (97%) of the total respondents said they were interested in Leavenworth County because they live here, with another 23.2% reporting they work in the county and 18.5% saying they are interested in county government. All other options were minimal.

By residential location
This question was analyzed by comparing it against the results for question 2, which asked people where they lived in the county. This uncovered whether respondents living within cities, in urban growth areas (within three miles of a city), or rural areas answered question 1 differently.

Of those who live in the county, a larger percentage who live in the city limits also work in the county (28.3%), compared to those who live in the urban growth area and work in the county (20.4%), or those who live in the rural, unincorporated areas and work in the county (18.2%).

By city
We also measured question 1 against question 3, which asked people which incorporated city they live near or in, to see if the answers varied greatly by community. The percentage of respondents who reported that they work and live in the county is higher in Leavenworth, Lansing, and Easton than the overall findings. This shows that respondents who live in cities like Tonganoxie, Basehor, Linwood and Bonner Springs are more likely to work elsewhere in the Kansas City metro area than within the county.

By age
When we analyzed this question by age, the only information that was worth noting is that older participants chose am interested in County government (31.6% of those in their 70s, and 52.2% of those in their 80s or older), at significantly higher numbers than those who are younger. For comparison, this choice was selected at a rate of 14% to 21.1% for all other age groups.

By length of residence
On average, the answers to question 1 varied only marginally when analyzed by how long the respondent had lived in the county.

Table 1: Respondents by city who also work in Leavenworth County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work in the County</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2. **If you live within Leavenworth County, where do you live?** (Within the city limits, within the urban growth area, or rural, unincorporated areas)

Overall
Respondents who live within the city limits of an incorporated city made up 41.6% of the completed surveys. Those in the urban areas were another 29.9%, and 27.3% of the respondents lived in rural, unincorporated areas.

By city and residential location
In question 3, respondents were asked to identify which city they lived in or near, which allowed comparison of the data from question 2 (in city limits, urban areas, or rural areas), with how many respondents were affiliated with each community.

Due to rounding, numbers may not add up to exactly 100%.
For example, of those 424 respondents who affiliate with Leavenworth, 87.3% lived in the city limits, 12.7% in the urban growth areas, and none in the rural areas. The breakdown for the other cities we included in this analysis is as follows:

**Lansing** (230 respondents) — 68.7% in city limits, 31.3% in urban growth areas, 0% in rural, unincorporated

**Tonganoxie** (217 respondents) — 56.2% in city limits, 43.8% in urban growth areas, 0% in rural, unincorporated

**Basehor** (465 respondents) — 39.1% in city limits, 60.7% in urban growth areas, 0.2% in rural, unincorporated areas

**Linwood** (53 respondents) — 15.1% in city limits, 83% in urban growth areas, 1.9% in rural, unincorporated areas

**Bonner Springs** (39 respondents) — 5.1% in the city limits, 94.9% in urban growth areas, 0% in rural, unincorporated

**Easton** (19 respondents) — 15.8% in city limits, 84.2% in urban growth areas, 0% in rural, unincorporated areas
By age

The percentage of respondents who lived inside the city limits of an incorporated city was consistently between 32.6% (age 50-59) to 56.1% (those 29 or younger).

The percentage of respondents that lived within the urban growth areas fluctuated between 21.5% of those 29 and younger and 37.2% of those age 40-49. Those in their 40s or 50s were more likely to live in the urban growth areas than those who were older or younger.

Likewise, those in their 50s and 60s were the most likely to live in rural, unincorporated areas, at 33.8% and 35.6% respectively. The percentage of those who lived in rural areas was lower among those older than 70 or younger than 49.

Table 2: Residential location by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>29 and younger</th>
<th>Age 30-39</th>
<th>Age 40-49</th>
<th>Age 50-59</th>
<th>Age 60-69</th>
<th>Age 70-79</th>
<th>Age 80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside the city limits of an incorporated city</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the city limits of an incorporated city, but within about three miles (urban growth area)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a rural, unincorporated area of the County</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By length of residency
People who have lived in the county for three years or fewer were the most likely to live inside the city limits at 58.5%, while those who have lived in the county 20+ years were the least likely to live in a city, at 37.3%.

The length of time someone has lived in the county was less predictable among those who live in the urban growth areas. Those who have lived in the county three years or fewer were the least likely to live in the urban growth areas at 22.3%, while those who were the most likely to live in the urban growth areas have lived in the county 10-19 years at 36.3%. However, those who have lived in the county 4-6 years or 7-9 years were almost as likely to live in the urban growth areas, at 31% and 31.6%, respectively.

Those who live in rural areas were the most likely to have lived in the county 20+ years at 32.3%, and those who have moved to the county more recently were the least likely to live in rural areas.

Table 3: Percentage of respondents living in each type of location by length of residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>3 Years or Less</th>
<th>4-6 Years</th>
<th>7-9 Years</th>
<th>10-19 Years</th>
<th>20+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside the city limits of an incorporated city</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the city limits of an incorporated city, but within about three miles</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a rural, unincorporated area of the County</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2007, we asked survey participants if they lived in a city, adjacent to a city, or in rural areas. In 2019, we worded the options a bit differently, asking respondents if they lived within the city limits of a city, in an urban growth area (within three miles of a city), or in a rural, unincorporated area.

The mix of participants has definitely changed, with many more people who represent the areas "adjacent" to a city (or in an urban growth area), and a decrease in the other two groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In City/Within City Limits</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to City/Within Urban Growth Areas</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>+20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Areas /Rural, Unincorporated Areas</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall
This breaks down to 29.1% affiliating with Leavenworth, 15.8% Lansing, 14.9% Tonganoxie, 31.9% Basehor, 3.6% Linwood, 2.7% Bonner Springs, and 1.3% in Easton. There were less than 1% living in or near any other community. (Note: Because of low participation rates in De Soto and Kansas City, the few respondents from these communities are not included in the analysis by city.)

By residential location
See the description under question 2 to see what percentage of people who chose each city live in the city limits, urban growth areas, or in rural, unincorporated areas of the county.
By age
Much can be learned about the respondents by looking at the age breakdown by city. For example, of those respondents who were 29 or younger, 43.4% affiliate with Leavenworth, 24.1% with Basehor, 13.3% with Lansing, 12.1% with Tonganoxie, 4.8% with Linwood, and 2.4% with Bonner Springs.

However, those in their 30s and 40s were more likely to live in Basehor (33.8%) than the other cities. For respondents in their 50s, there were about the same number who affiliated with Leavenworth (32.5%) and Basehor (30.4%). Those in their 60s had the largest numbers in Basehor (33.3%), with also a significant number in Leavenworth (29.5%).

Among the oldest participants, the largest numbers were in Basehor, with 33.6% of those in their 70s and 43.8% of those 80 or older. There also were a significant number of respondents in their 70s living in Leavenworth (29%), and the second largest number of those 80+ live in Tonganoxie (25%).

Table 4: Age group by city affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>29 and younger</th>
<th>Age 30-39</th>
<th>Age 40-49</th>
<th>Age 50-59</th>
<th>Age 60-69</th>
<th>Age 70-79</th>
<th>Age 80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonganoxie</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basehor</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner Springs</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By length of residence

New residents to the county were the most likely to live in Basehor, with 44.7% of those who have lived in the county three years or less. Another 23.7% of respondents who are new to the county in the past three years affiliated with Leavenworth and 15.8% with Tonganoxie.

Of those who have lived in the county 4-6 years, Basehor again had the largest percentage (36.3%), compared to Leavenworth at 23%, Lansing at 17.8%, and Tonganoxie at 16.3%.

Those who have lived in the county 7-9 years were slightly more likely to live in Leavenworth than Basehor (28.6% compared to 25.7%). Those who have been there 10-19 years were more likely to live in Basehor than Leavenworth (35.7% compared to 23.3%).

When we looked at those who have lived in the county the longest (20 or more years), Leavenworth had the largest percentage at 33.1%, with Basehor at 27.7%, Lansing at 19.5%, and Tonganoxie at 12.6%. All other cities had 3% or less of their participants who have lived there more than 20 years.

Table 5: City by length of residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>3 Years or Less</th>
<th>4-6 Years</th>
<th>7-9 Years</th>
<th>10-19 Years</th>
<th>20+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonganoxie</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basehor</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner Springs</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Affiliation

In 2007, survey respondents were asked to indicate which, if any, city they lived in. In 2019, we asked respondents which city they live in or near. So the questions weren’t identical, but similar. The breakdown of respondents, however, was quite different and most likely reflects how cities have changed in the past 12 years.

We should also keep in mind that the 2019 online survey method also may have had a broader distribution than the paper-based survey had in 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basehor</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>+21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonner Springs</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>+1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Leavenworth*</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>+6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>-22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>+2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonganoxie</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*We did not break out Ft. Leavenworth from the greater Leavenworth area in 2019.
Q4. Please choose the top three reasons you live in Leavenworth County.

TOP 3 REASONS you live in Leavenworth County

- Rural atmosphere: 69.3%
- Close to family: 52.2%
- Proximity to Kansas City: 50.5%
- Cost of living: 37.7%
- Close to work: 34.8%
- Schools: 31.9%
- Other: 18.2%
- Historic downtown business area: 5.4%

Overall
Why do people choose to live in Leavenworth County? The top three responses were rural atmosphere (69.3%), close to family (52.2%), and proximity to Kansas City (50.5%), although many of the other options also scored large numbers. The least selected option was historic downtown business areas at 5.4%.
**Other responses**

Other responses to question 4 were written in by 367 participants (18.2%) to explain why they live in Leavenworth County. Of those responses, there were 19 common themes. The top three (excluding duplicates of multiple-choice options) were quiet, peaceful and private atmosphere, military brought me here, and farming or agriculture. Write-in responses that were duplicates of multiple-choice options are noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common “Write-in” Responses</th>
<th>Number of related entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have/family has always lived here (duplicate)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural atmosphere (duplicate)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet, peaceful and private</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military brought me here</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming or agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable property/land/housing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to shopping/city/airport/other (duplicate)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/None</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to move, but want to</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less regulation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living (duplicate)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low taxes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture that aligns with my political or religious ideology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to friends</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just enjoy living here</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools (duplicate)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By residential location
For those who live within the city limits of an incorporated city, the top two reasons why they live in Leavenworth County were neck-and-neck: proximity to Kansas City (55.8%) and close to family (55.5%). Also scoring high were close to work (46.9%), cost of living (42.6%), and rural atmosphere (42%).

For those living in an urban growth area, the most important reason by far was rural atmosphere (87.2%), followed by proximity to Kansas City (48.8%) and close to family (48.7%).

Those in the rural, unincorporated areas scored rural atmosphere extremely high at 92.7%, and close to family at 51.8%. Proximity to Kansas City was third at 43.6%.

Table 6: Top three reasons why you live in Leavenworth County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Within City Limits</th>
<th>Urban Growth Area</th>
<th>Rural Unincorporated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to work</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural atmosphere</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to family</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Kansas City</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic downtown business areas</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By city
Why do people in different cities choose to live in Leavenworth County? Much variation was found. The top choices for each city are as follows:

**Leavenworth** — Close to family (63.3%), close to work (61.3%), proximity to Kansas City (49.9%), and cost of living (46.3%).

**Lansing** — Proximity to Kansas City (56.3%), rural atmosphere (49.8%), close to family (48.5%), close to work (47.6%) and cost of living (44.5%).

**Tonganoxie** — Rural atmosphere (75.8%), close to family (55.8%), and proximity to Kansas City (54%).

**Basehor** — Rural atmosphere (79.5%), proximity to Kansas City (54.5%), and schools (54.1%).

**Linwood** — Rural atmosphere (90.2%), cost of living (49%), and close to family (47.1%).

**Bonner Springs** — Rural atmosphere (94.7%), proximity to Kansas City (57.9%), and cost of living (47.4%).

**Easton** — Rural atmosphere (89.5%), close to family (52.6%), and proximity to Kansas City (47.4%).

---

### Table 7: Top reasons why people live in Leavenworth County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>474%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to work</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural atmosphere</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to family</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Kansas City</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>474%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic downtown business areas</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. (continued)

The county’s **RURAL ATMOSPHERE** is its strongest attractor for new residents.

**By age**

The differences on this question by age were also insightful, and should be kept in mind when developing the comprehensive plan and marketing the county for new residents and other economic development efforts in the future. However, across the board, it is clear that rural atmosphere is definitely the county’s strongest asset.

**29 and younger** — The youngest residents live in Leavenworth to be *close to family* (70.1%). This could include young adults still living at home, or perhaps even young parents wanting to live close to the support of grandparents. *Rural atmosphere* (51.4%), *proximity to Kansas City* (45.8%), *cost of living* (43.9%), and *close to work* (43.9%) also were frequently chosen by this age cohort.

**30 to 39** — Those in their 30s live in the county primarily because of the *rural atmosphere* (60.1%), *to be close to family* (52.8%), *for proximity to Kansas City* (47%), *cost of living* (42.6%), and *schools* (42%).

**40 to 49** — Respondents in their 40s gravitated the most toward *rural atmosphere* (71.6%), but many also chose *proximity to Kansas City* (46.5%), *close to family* (44.9%), and *schools* (44.2%).

**50 to 59** — Those in their 50s also chose *rural atmosphere* the most often (75.2%), with *proximity to Kansas City* (48.7%) and *close to family* (48.5%) at lower, yet significant, percentages.

**60 to 69** — Nearing retirement age, *rural atmosphere* continues to be the most frequent choice (75.7%), with *proximity to Kansas City* a strong second place (59%), and *close to family* in third (49.9%).

**70 to 79** — Respondents in their 70s also chose *rural atmosphere* most commonly at 69.8%, with *proximity to Kansas City* at 65.1% and *close to family* at 61.1%.

**80+** — The oldest residents were adamant that *rural atmosphere* was important to them at 86.4%, while 77.3% live in the county to *be close to family*, and 57.5% because of the *proximity to Kansas City*. 
By length of residence
The reasons people choose to live in Leavenworth County were compared against how long they have lived in the county to see if length of residency plays a factor. For the most part, the responses were fairly consistent across the different groups, with rural atmosphere always the most common choice.

Three years or less — Rural atmosphere (65.4%), proximity to Kansas City (53.7%), and cost of living (51.6%).

4 to 6 years — Rural atmosphere (70.1%), proximity to Kansas City (57.5%), and cost of living (48.9%).

7 to 9 years — Rural atmosphere (69.5%), proximity to Kansas City (57.9%), close to work (47.4%), and cost of living (40%).

10 to 19 years — Rural atmosphere (72%), proximity to Kansas City (58.1%), and cost of living (42.2%).

20+ years — Rural atmosphere (69.9%), close to family (65.4%), proximity to Kansas City (46.5%).

Top reasons residents live in the county
We changed up the options in 2019 from the 2007 version of this same question, but the top choice remained the consistent: Rural Atmosphere. Many of the other top five answers were the same or similar between surveys as well.

Each respondent in the 2019 online version chose more options than they did on paper in 2007, making the overall percentages of people who chose each option much higher.
Q5. Where do you think future growth in Leavenworth County should occur? (Select all that apply)

**Overall**
The majority of respondents chose *within cities* as the most common answer to question 5, with an overall average of 63.1%. *On the edge of existing cities* was the second most common answer at 41.9%. In nearly every scenario in which this question was analyzed, this order was consistent.

After these two choices, in distant third was a tie for *undeveloped rural areas* and *I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County* at 11.0% each. *Along County Road 1* was the least common choice (10.3%) other than *not sure* (9.5%).

**By residential location**
All groups agreed that growth should be prioritized to cities, with 64.4% of those living in cities, 64.5% of those in the urban growth area, and 60.2% of those in the rural, unincorporated areas choosing this option. The second most common answer in all three groups was *on the edge of existing cities* (at 46.3%, 33.8%, and 42.6%, respectively).

Those who live in rural, unincorporated areas were the most likely to choose *I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County* at 17.2%, compared to 5.9% in the cities and 13.3% in the urban growth areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cities</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the edge of existing cities</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped rural areas</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along County Road 1</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The city with the largest percentage of residents who don’t want GROWTH in the county? Linwood at 20.4%.

By city
Consistently, respondents from each city also chose within cities as their top choice, except participants from Easton chose within cities and on the edge of existing cities at the same percentage.

The city that had the highest numbers of respondents choose I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County was Linwood, at 20.4%.

**Table 8: Where should growth occur?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cities</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the edge of existing cities</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped rural areas</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along County Road 1</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want to see growth in</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Q5.* (continued)
It was noticed during several points of this analysis that the group of residents who moved to the county 7-9 years ago (around 2010-2012) answered questions differently than other groups. The consultant team is curious whether there was a triggering event for this (such as a building boom during this time or a specific economic development activity), or if it is a pure anomaly.

Q5. (continued)

The **youngest** age group was the **most** likely to choose

**By age**
With the exception of the 80+ group, all age cohorts chose within cities as their top choice. Those in the 80+ group chose on the edge of existing cities as their top choice, 47.8% versus 43.5%.

It is interesting that the age group that had the largest percentage of people choosing *I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County* were the youngest participants, with 22% of those 29 and younger choosing this answer. All other age groups were between 7.1% and 10.9%.

**By length of residence**
When analyzed by length of residence in the county, every group also chose within cities as their most common answer, by a significant amount more than the second most common answer, on the edge of existing cities.

The group with the largest percentage of people who chose *I don’t want to see growth in Leavenworth County* were people who have lived in the county 7-9 years.¹

**Where future growth should occur**
We changed the wording on the options between surveys, but in both the 2019 and 2007 surveys, the top choice of respondents as to where growth should occur within the county was primarily in the cities or adjacent to the cities. However, on the 2007 survey, respondents also were given the choice of BOTH in the city and rural areas, which they were not given in 2019, so the percentages are not truly comparable.

¹It was noticed during several points of this analysis that the group of residents who moved to the county 7-9 years ago (around 2010-2012) answered questions differently than other groups. The consultant team is curious whether there was a triggering event for this (such as a building boom during this time or a specific economic development activity), or if it is a pure anomaly.
Q6. In regard to unincorporated areas not governed by a city, should Leavenworth County control where new development occurs?

Overall
Just slightly more than half of our respondents answered yes to this question, with 28.7% choosing no and 20.7% choosing not sure.

By residential location
Responses to this question were consistent among the three groups, with yes responses from respondents within city limits at 50.1%, in the urban growth area at 51.7%, and in the rural, unincorporated areas at 49.5%.

By city
All of the cities except Easton had yes as their most common response, with 60% of respondents in Bonner Springs, 56% of respondents in Lansing, and 54.3% of those in Basehor choosing yes.

In Easton, 33.3% of people chose yes, while 44.4% chose no. Among the other cities, the communities with the most no answers included Tonganoxie at 33%, Linwood at 32.6%, Leavenworth at 28.5%, and Basehor at 27.7%.

The cities with the most respondents who were not sure included Linwood at 26.5%, Leavenworth at 23.8%, and Lansing at 23.4%.
Older people were more likely to believe county government should control **WHERE** new development occurs.

**By age**
Younger residents were less likely to believe that Leavenworth County should control where growth occurs than older residents were. Of those 29 and younger, 34.9% chose yes, while 41.3% chose no and 23.9% were not sure. For comparison, those in their 50s chose yes at a rate of 49.8%, with 30.1% no and 20.1% not sure.

The two oldest age groups had the highest percentage of people who believed the county government should control where growth occurs, with 61.9% of those in their 70s and 73.9% of those 80+ choosing yes. Only 13.6% of those in their 70s and 8.7% of those in their 80s selected no.

**By length of residence**
Length of residence was not a major factor on this question. Respondents who chose yes did so between 42.3% and 52.1% across all groups. No responses and not sure responses were also fairly consistent in all groups.

**Controlling development in the county**
In 2007, respondents were asked, “Should Leavenworth County control the location and type of future development?” In 2019, we broke these into two separate questions because they were asking two different things.

In 2007, 76.3% of people chose yes to the combined question. In 2019, 50.6% chose yes on the question about where new development should occur, and 58.2% chose yes that the county should control what type of new development occurs.
In regard to unincorporated areas not governed by a city, should Leavenworth County control what type of new development occurs? (Residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.)

**Overall**
Nearly 60% of respondents answered this question in the affirmative: 58.2% yes, 25.6% no, and 16.3% not sure.

**By residential location**
The answers to this question were fairly consistent among those in cities (58.4% yes), urban growth areas (59.5% yes) and rural, unincorporated areas (55.2% yes). The percentage that chose not sure was also consistent, ranging from 15.4% (rural) to 16.8% (cities).
Older people were more likely to believe county government should control WHAT TYPE of new development occurs.

**By city**
While the majority of people in all of these cities chose yes, some cities did so at a higher percentage — Bonner Springs (68.6%), Lansing (65.6%), and Basehor (62.1%). Fewer respondents from Easton (50%), Leavenworth (53.9%), and Tonganoxie (54.8%) chose yes.

The not sure responses were mostly in the 16%-18% range, with the exception of Bonner Springs at 11.4% and Linwood at 24.5%.

**By age**
It is interesting that the older a respondent was, the more likely they were to believe that the county should be able to control what type of development occurs. Respondents 29 and younger chose yes at only 45.9%, while those in their 30s, 40s, and 50s chose yes at around 55%-57%, those in their 60s and 70s chose yes at around 64%, and those in their 80s chose yes at 87%.

The not sure percentages were fairly consistent across groups, mostly between 14%-17%; however, those in their 80s chose not sure at only 4.4%.

**By length of residence**
Length of residence replies only varied minimally, with those who have lived in the county three years or fewer choosing yes in the greatest numbers (61.3%), while all other groups were between 49% and 59%. The not sure percentages were consistently between 15.5% and 17.8%.
Q8. The following types of new development should be pursued for Leavenworth County: (Select all that apply)

Overall
For this question, respondents could choose as many answers as they wanted. The most common choice of all respondents was outdoor recreation spaces — defined on the survey as athletic fields, parks, playgrounds, trails, open spaces, etc. — at 60.2% of all responses. This was by far the most popular choice.

Three other choices that were commonly chosen were commercial development (defined as shopping/retail/office/dining) at 48.6%, suburban-style, single-family housing developments at 44.1%, agriculture at 39%, and mixed-use development (defined as retail/office/residential/commercial in one development) at 32%.

Receiving the least interest from respondents were multi-family housing (duplexes, apartments) at 15%, an office or business park at 21.9%, and industrial/manufacturing at 25.4%.

Not sure received 3% of responses, and I do not support new development in Leavenworth County received 8.9%.
Other responses

Other received 7.5% of responses to question 8, the top three of which were: only in existing cities, affordable housing, and grocery stores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common “Write-in” Responses</th>
<th>Number of related entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only within existing cities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery stores</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think the government should interfere with growth</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior housing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County should focus on fixing what it already has first</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not industry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (duplicate)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever will lower my taxes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth that maintains rural areas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something that brings more jobs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger residential lot sizes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No development (duplicate)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalize downtown areas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas (duplicate)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something that preserves nature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation (duplicate)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near city limits (duplicate)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want representation for any County decisions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By residential location
Residents of the cities have the greatest demand for outdoor recreation spaces, which begs the question as to whether this lack is really a county or city problem. Those in the city limits and urban growth area chose this as their top response at 68.6% and 59.5%; however, those in rural areas chose agriculture as their top priority at 55.8%, and outdoor recreation at 48.3%.

For those living in the city limits, other top choices included commercial development at 63.7%, suburban-style, single-family housing at 49.6%, and mixed-use development at 39.4%. Receiving low response rates were multi-family residential housing (22.4%), agriculture (25.3%), office or business park (26.3%), and industrial/manufacturing (29.8%). Only 3% chose I do not support new development in the county.

Besides outdoor recreation, respondents in the urban growth areas favored development in agriculture (44.4%), suburban-style, single-family housing (42.5%), and commercial development (42.3%). Of this group, 10.1% selected I do not support new development in the county.

After agriculture and outdoor recreation, those living in rural, unincorporated areas preferred suburban-style, single-family housing at 37.5%, and commercial development at 32.7%. A considerable 17.6% chose I do not support new development in Leavenworth County.
Table 9: Types of new development the county should pursue (by city)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban-style, single-family housing developments</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family residential housing (duplexes, apartments)</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development (shopping/retail/office/dining)</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use development (retail/office/residential/commercial in one development)</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/manufacturing</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/business park</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation spaces (athletic fields, parks, playgrounds, trails, open spaces, etc.)</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not support new development in Leavenworth County</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10: Types of new development the county should pursue (by age group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>29 and younger</th>
<th>Age 30-39</th>
<th>Age 40-49</th>
<th>Age 50-59</th>
<th>Age 60-69</th>
<th>Age 70-79</th>
<th>Age 80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban-style, single-family housing developments</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family residential housing (duplexes, apartments)</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development (shopping/retail/office/dining)</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use development (retail/office/residential/commercial in one development)</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/manufacturing</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/business park</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation spaces (athletic fields, parks, playgrounds, trails, open spaces, etc.)</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not support new development in Leavenworth County</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By age**

All age groups — except those in their 70s — had outdoor recreation as their most common choice (those in their 70s had it as their third choice). In nearly every circumstance, commercial development and suburban-style, single family housing were the second and third most common choice. Agriculture was the fourth most common choice, although it was the second most common for those 29 and younger.

Again, significant differences in percentages are highlighted on the table.
By length of residence
How long someone has lived in the county did not make a significant difference in the results to this question; however, those who have lived in the county 20+ years were less likely to choose outdoor recreation spaces than those who had lived in the county for a shorter period of time (but it was still the most common answer for all groups).

Outdoor Recreation
In 2007, several survey questions were asked related to starting a county parks and recreation program, including whether such a program should be considered, which 63.2% of respondents chose yes to. Another 60.3% of people also responded yes, that the county should develop a county hiking, biking, equestrian trail system.

While these same questions were not asked on the 2019 survey, question 8 did find that the most common answer selected for what type of new development the county should pursue was outdoor recreation spaces, with 60.2% of respondents choosing this option. This shows there has been strong interest in more county-operated outdoor recreation options for many years.
Overall

Maintenance of existing roads/construction of new roads was by far the most common answer to question 9, with 71.1% of respondents choosing this response. Other top concerns included preserving natural areas and wetlands (43.7%), rapid residential growth in rural areas (41.8%), lack of commercial development (38.7%), and lack of parks, trails and outdoor recreation spaces (38.5%). The least common concern was private property maintenance (16.6%).
By residential location
Those in the rural areas were the most likely to choose maintenance of existing roads/construction of new roads at 76.3%, with 70.2% choosing this who live within city limits and 67% choosing this in the urban growth area.

There was some difference in how respondents living in different types of residential locations preferred the other top answers:

**Within city limits** — lack of commercial development (58.7%) and lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces (47.4%).

**Urban growth areas** — rapid residential growth in rural areas (55.4%) and preserving natural areas and wetlands (44.4%).

**Rural, unincorporated areas** — rapid residential growth in rural areas (55.9%) and preserving natural areas and wetlands (49.7%). (Note that this group has low interest in new commercial development, with only 20.3% choosing this option.)
**Other responses**

The top three concerns noted in the other responses to question 9 (excludes duplicates) were heavy or “unclean” industry in the county (respondents mentioned specifically Tyson and the quarry), improving existing infrastructure and rural access to infrastructure, and high taxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common “Write-in” Responses</th>
<th>Number of related entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy or “unclean” industry in the county (i.e., quarry, Tyson)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of existing roads (duplicate)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losing rural areas/charm and crowding (duplicate)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving existing infrastructure and rural access to infrastructure</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High taxes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with county government</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public transportation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for better internet/rural internet services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much governmental interference</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost of living</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency/county resident input</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of planning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed-mindedness that inhibits growth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Basehor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of housing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective economic development efforts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to grocery stores or restaurants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving agricultural land</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems arising out of uncontrolled growth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trails and outdoor recreation spaces (duplicate)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conservation (duplicate)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of animal services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of special use permits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By city
It seems natural that those who affiliate with different cities would respond to questions about concerns differently, as each city has had its own unique set of challenges in recent years.

While all seven cities ranked maintenance of existing roads/construction of new roads as their top choice and private property maintenance as their least important concern, there was a lot of variety in how each city responded to the other options and how concerned respondents were about each topic. Here are the top second, third, and fourth ranked concerns for each city pulled out for comparison, with the full chart of all responses provided below:

Leavenworth — lack of commercial development (57.3%), lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces (41.6%), and preserving natural areas and wetlands (38.2%).

Lansing — lack of commercial development (53.8%), lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces (47.6%), and preserving natural areas and wetlands (44%).

Tonganoxie — lack of commercial development (48.2%), preserving natural areas and wetlands (41.6%), and lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces (37.1%).

Basehor — rapid residential growth in rural areas (52.4%), lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces (44.1%), and preserving natural areas and wetlands (40.4%). (Lack of commercial development came in at only 36.5% for Basehor.)

Linwood — rapid residential growth in rural areas (71.4%), preserving natural areas and wetlands (61.2%), and lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces (36.7%). (Lack of commercial development came in at only 28.6% for Linwood.)

Bonner Springs — preserving natural areas and wetlands (48.6%), lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces (40%), and rapid residential growth in rural areas (37.1%). (Lack of commercial development came in at only 11.4% for Bonner Springs.)

Easton — preserving natural areas and wetlands and rapid residential growth in rural areas (both at 50%); lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces, lack of commercial development and private property maintenance all were selected by 38.9% of respondents. (Note: Only 18 people from Easton responded to this question, which increased the likelihood of ties in the rankings.)
Table 11: Concerns by city (ranked by percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapid residential growth in rural areas</td>
<td>21.2% (6)</td>
<td>33.0% (5)</td>
<td>36.0% (5)</td>
<td>52.4% (2)</td>
<td>71.4% (2)</td>
<td>37.1% (4)</td>
<td>50.0% (2 tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parks, trails, and outdoor recreation spaces</td>
<td>41.6% (3)</td>
<td>47.6% (3)</td>
<td>37.1% (4)</td>
<td>44.1% (3)</td>
<td>36.7% (4)</td>
<td>40.0% (3)</td>
<td>38.9% (3 tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving natural areas and wetlands</td>
<td>38.2% (4)</td>
<td>44.0% (4)</td>
<td>41.6% (3)</td>
<td>40.4% (4)</td>
<td>61.2% (3)</td>
<td>48.6% (2)</td>
<td>50.0% (2 tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of existing roads/construction of new roads</td>
<td>78.5% (1)</td>
<td>61.9% (1)</td>
<td>69.0% (1)</td>
<td>62.8% (1)</td>
<td>75.5% (1)</td>
<td>65.7% (1)</td>
<td>83.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of commercial development (services, retail, manufacturing,</td>
<td>57.3% (2)</td>
<td>53.8% (2)</td>
<td>48.2% (2)</td>
<td>36.5% (5)</td>
<td>28.6% (5)</td>
<td>11.4% (6)</td>
<td>38.9% (3 tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertainment, and dining options)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private property maintenance</td>
<td>24.1% (5)</td>
<td>16.5% (6)</td>
<td>15.2% (6)</td>
<td>11.8% (6)</td>
<td>12.2% (6)</td>
<td>8.6% (7)</td>
<td>38.9% (3 tie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.0% (7)</td>
<td>9.2% (7)</td>
<td>9.1% (7)</td>
<td>7.4% (7)</td>
<td>10.2% (7)</td>
<td>17.1%* (5)</td>
<td>5.6% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This reflects four write-in comments regarding the sand quarry and two comments regarding frustrations that voters in this area are not well represented in county government. Keep in mind that overall participation in Bonner Springs was only 39 responses, so six write-ins look more significant in relation to other communities.
Should new development be prioritized in locations where utility infrastructure is near or already exists?

Overall
Responses to this question were fairly consistent every way they were analyzed at the responses. In total, we had 71.4% yes, 10.9% no, and 17.7% not sure. With a greater number of not sure responses than no responses, it can be assumed there are many participants who do not have previous background knowledge on this issue.

By residential location
The percentage of yes responses was similar among those who live within the city limits (74.6%), the urban growth areas (69.1%), and in the rural, unincorporated areas (68.8%). Those who live in the cities were the least likely to choose no at 8.9% compared to 12.6% in the other two groups. The not sure responses were fairly consistent among these groups as well.
Table 12: Should development be prioritized where utility infrastructure exists (by city)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By city**

The willingness and ability of each city to invest in new infrastructure has likely been impacted by each city’s experience related to new infrastructure costs. There is a significant range of percentages of yes responses among the cities, with Lansing having the highest percentage of yes responses (80.3%) and Easton the lowest (50%).

**By age**

Our youngest participants seem to be the least concerned about prioritizing new development where utilities already exist, with those 29 and younger choosing yes at a significantly lower percentage (61.5%) than the other age groups (all between 69% and 79%). The group with the fewest no responses were those in their 70s.

The oldest (80+) and the youngest (29 and younger) groups had the hardest time answering this question, as these two groups had the highest percentage of not sure responses.

**By length of residence**

Length of residence appears to have had little impact on this question as well, with little difference between those who have just moved to the county in the past three years (71.2% responding yes) compared to those who have lived here 20+ years (71.3%).

For some unknown reason, those who have lived in the county 7-9 years — not those new to the county or who have lived in the county for two decades or more — were the most likely to say yes (80.2%) and were the least likely to choose not sure (10.4%).

---

\(^2\) As noted in question 5, we are curious if there was a triggering event between 2010 to 2012 that might have influenced the opinions of this group of respondents.
Q11. Should the county create a countywide sewer program, and start building sewer lines and treatment plans near cities to accommodate new growth?

Overall
Respondents seemed torn as to how to answer this question and, in retrospect, without information about costs to build such a program, projected benefits, and a strong understanding of current city sewer system limitations, this was a difficult question to ask of the general population. Almost the same percentage of people chose yes (36.9%) as chose no (36.5%), and a significant number were not sure (26.6%).

By residential location
Those living in cities were much more likely to choose yes to this question (50.8%) than the other two groups (urban growth area at 29.7% and rural at 23%). Likewise, the flipside was true, that those living in cities were less likely to choose no (20.2%) compared to those in urban growth areas (46.4%) or rural areas (53.1%).

The not sure answers were consistent between 24% and 29.1%, with the high end of the range for the within city limits group.
By city
Respondents from Leavenworth (46.6%), Lansing (43.1%), and Tonganoxie (43.2%) were the most likely to choose yes to this question. Yes responses in Linwood and Basehor were only slightly less common at 38.8% and 37.9% respectively; however, they were significantly less in Easton (16.7%) and Bonner Springs (22.9%).

The highest percentage of no responses came from Easton (50%), Bonner Springs (45.7%), and Linwood (42.9%). The highest not sure responses were from Easton (33.3%), Lansing (32.1%), Bonner Springs (31.4%), and Leavenworth (30.1%).

By age
The age group that was the most likely to choose yes was those in their 30s at 43.8%, and the least likely group to choose yes was those 80+ at 26.1%. The group most likely to choose no was respondents 29 and younger at 41.3%.

Those in their 60s and those who were 80+ had the highest percentage of not sure responses at 30% and 39.1% respectively.

By length of residence
New residents to the county were the most likely to select yes at 49.7%, while 33.1% of respondents who have lived in the county for 20+ years chose yes.

The opposite was also true, in that those who have lived in the county the longest (20+ years) were most likely to choose no (42%), and those new to the county in the past three years were the least likely to say no (23%).

The not sure responses ranged from 19.8% for those who had lived in the county 7-9 years to 30.3% for those in the 4-6 year group.

County Sewer System
This question was asked in almost the exact same language between 2007 and 2019; however, the results were dramatically different. In 2007, 63.6% chose yes, while in 2019, 36.9% chose yes. The percentage of respondents who chose no was much higher in 2019 at 36.5% versus 20.8% in 2007. Again, significantly fewer people (77) answered this question in 2007 than in 2019, so this isn’t truly an apples-to-apples comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>-26.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12. Who should be responsible for the cost of extending services such as sewers, waterlines and other utilities to new developments?

Overall, residents were clear that they do not want the county to bear the brunt of the cost of new infrastructure development, with only 3.3% choosing the county on question 12. Some are willing to split the costs between the county and developers, with 44.9% choosing a combination of the county and developers. However, the largest percentage said that developers should be responsible for the cost at 46.5%. Another 5.3% were not sure.
By residential location
When analyzed by whether respondents lived in a city, an urban growth area, or a rural area, it was still resoundingly clear that residents do not believe the County should pay for these costs. Only 4.6% of those in the cities, 2.3% of those in the urban growth areas, and 1.1% of those in the rural areas believe the County should cover those costs.

However, there was more debate about whether costs should be split or covered entirely by the developer. Those in the cities preferred splitting the cost in some fashion (54.4%) rather than charging the developer the entire cost (34.8%).

In the urban growth areas, the reverse was true, in that more people believed the developer should cover the cost (52.8%) than share the cost with the County (40.5%).

In the rural areas, the difference was even greater, with 59.8% saying the developer should pay the entire cost and 32.9% choosing the combination option.

In all three groups, the not sure percentage was between 4.4% and 6.2%.
By city

Lansing had the highest percentage of the County responses at 5%. No respondents from Bonner Springs or Easton chose the County. The other cities were all less than 5%.

The developer was selected in the highest percentages in Bonner Springs (65.7%), with Linwood (49%), Basehor (48.7%), Easton (44%), and Tonganoxie (42.6%) all at more than 40%. In Basehor, Linwood, and Bonner Springs, more people chose the developer than chose a combination.

Leavenworth (53.9%), Lansing (55.1%), Tonganoxie (46.7%), and Easton (55.6%) were more likely to suggest the costs be split in some combination than all billed to the developer.

No one in Linwood or Easton chose not sure, while the other communities had between 5.1% and 8.6% who chose this response.

Table 13: Who should be responsible for infrastructure costs in new developments (by city)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The county</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of the county and developers</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By age
While the percentage of respondents who chose the county as their answer for question 12 was small throughout the survey, the youngest participants had the highest number at 6%. No one 80+ believes the county should cover these new development costs.

Most age groups were split between whether the developer should pay these costs or they should be paid in combination between the developer and the county. The 29 and younger group and the 80+ group had more people choose the combination option than the developer, while the other groups were closely divided between the two options.

Table 14: Who should be responsible for infrastructure costs in new developments (by age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>29 and younger</th>
<th>Age 30-39</th>
<th>Age 40-49</th>
<th>Age 50-59</th>
<th>Age 60-69</th>
<th>Age 70-79</th>
<th>Age 80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The county</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The developer</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of the county and developers</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By length of residence
Again, length of residence does not seem to be a significant factor in this decision; however, the group that was the most likely to choose the county was those who had lived in the county 7-9 years³ (8.3%). Those who’d lived in the county three years or fewer chose the county at 4.2%, and those who’d lived in the county 20+ years chose it at 2.9%.

Both groups of respondents who have moved to the county over the past six years preferred the combination model over the developer bearing the total cost, while the two options were rated similarly in both the 7-9 years and 10-19 years groups. The only age group that truly favored the developer bearing the cost over a combination method was those who had lived in the county 20+ years (49.6% developer to 42.6% combination).

³This is another data point where this 7-9 year group’s answers varied from the others.
Q13. Who should be responsible for the cost of extending services such as sewers, waterlines and other utilities to new developments?

**Overall**
The majority of respondents (57.1%) chose yes on this question, with 29.5% choosing no and 13.4% responding with not sure.

**By residential location**
Those who live within cities were the most supportive of this question, with 69.7% responding yes, 16.9% no, and 13.4% not sure.

The topic was more controversial among respondents in the urban growth area (who would be the most directly affected), with only 46.2% choosing yes, 41.9% no, and 11.9% not sure.

Those who live in rural, unincorporated areas answered similarly to those in the urban growth area (49.8% yes, 35.9% no, 14.4% not sure).
By city
Those in Tonganoxie (66%), Leavenworth (63.6%), and Lansing (64.7%) were the most supportive of this idea, while those in the other cities were supportive, but to a lesser extent, with Linwood at 55.1%, Basehor at 52.7%, Easton at 50%, and Bonner Springs at 48.6%.

The greatest opposition to this idea came in Bonner Springs (40% no), Basehor (36.7% no), and Linwood (34.7% no). All other cities had a no percentage in the low 20%-25% range.

The groups who chose not sure the most were from Easton (27.8%), Leavenworth (16.2%), and Lansing (14.2%). All others had a not sure rate between 9-11%.

Older people are more likely to support urban growth areas being required to meet city design/building standards.

By age
Older respondents were more likely to select yes to this question than were those in the younger age groups. The highest percentage were those 80+ (69.6% yes), then those in their 70s (68.4% yes) and 60s (62.1% yes). Those who were younger also had more yes responses than no, but at a lower percentage: 29 and younger (52.3%), 30s (57.6%), 40s (54%), and 50s (52.5%).

The largest percentage of no responses came from those 29 and younger (34.9%), those in their 50s (34.4%), and those in their 40s (32.8%). The group with the lowest percentage of no responses were in their 70s (19.4%).

All of the not sure responses were in the 12%-15% range, with the exception of respondents 80+, who chose not sure at only 8.7%.
By length of residence
Length of residence did not have much impact on this question, in that there is not much of a
difference in the results by group or trends in the findings. The group with the highest percentage of
yes responses were those who have lived in the county three years or fewer (64.4%), but the group
with the lowest amount of yes responses was those who have lived in the county 10-19 years, at
54.9%. All other groups were somewhere between 55.4% and 60.4%.

Likewise, the smallest number of no responses was in the three years or fewer group at 22.5%, with
all of the other groups between 29.2% and 31.3%.

The not sure responses were fairly consistent among groups, with the 7-9 year group the lowest at
10.4% and the 10-19 year group the highest at 13.7%.

---

City design standards for rural subdivisions near cities
The percentage of respondents who chose yes to this question dropped in 2019 from 2007; however, this was only on the second survey in 2007, meaning only 76 people answered this question in 2007 while 1,921 responded in 2019. The larger respondent pool in 2019 strengthens the validity of the newer finding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall
While in question 13 the majority of people said yes, that homes close to a neighboring city (in the urban growth area) should be built to city design/building standards, in question 14 regarding homes built in unincorporated areas of the county, the majority of overall respondents selected no at 58.7%.

By residential location
The gap between yes and no respondents was not quite as great when looking only at those who live in the cities (42.5% no compared to 39.7% yes). City dwellers also had the largest percentage who chose not sure (17.9%), which likely indicates that those who live in cities are not as informed about this topic or have not thought about it as much as those living in more rural areas.

Residents from the urban growth area and rural, unincorporated areas responded no in much larger — and very similar — percentages (70.5% in urban growth area and 73% in rural). Only 23.3% of those in the urban growth area and 18.7% of those in the rural areas chose yes. The percentage that reported they were not sure was also small in both groups, with 6.2% of those in the urban growth area and 8.3% of those in rural areas.
**By city**
Likewise, the cities in more rural parts of the county were more likely to oppose this question, with Easton respondents choosing no at 66.7%, Linwood at 65.3%, Basehor at 62.1%, and Bonner Springs at 60%. Tonganoxie residents chose no at 51.8%, Lansing at 48.2%, and Leavenworth at 47.6%.

The largest yes percentages were from Lansing (39.9%), Leavenworth (35.3%), and Bonner Springs (31.4%).

The respondents who chose not sure in the greatest numbers were in Leavenworth (17%), while those in Easton chose not sure at only 5.6%. All other cities were between 8.2% and 12.7%.

**Table 15: Concerned about standards of homes in unincorporated areas (by city)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By age
Our youngest participants (29 and younger) were the least likely to choose yes to question 14 at only 18.4%. Those in their 30s to 40s answered yes in similar percentages (30s at 25.4%, 40s at 27.9%, 50s at 26.1%).

Those most concerned were those 60 and older (60s at 35.8%, 70s at 40.7%, 80+ at 39.1%).

Likewise, those who responded no were more likely to be younger, with the highest percentage being 65% of those in their 50s and 63.3% of those 29 and younger. The four age groups under 60 all said no at a rate between 58.9% and 65. For comparison, the no rates for 60+ ranged from 43.4% (80+) to 52.1% (60s).

The largest groups to choose not sure were the youngest group (18.4%) and the oldest (17.4%), with all other groups between 8.9% and 15.7%.

By length of residence
How long someone had lived in the county seemed to only have a minimal impact on the results to this question. The group most concerned was those who have lived in the county three years or fewer (34%), only slightly higher than the averages for the other groups, which ranged from 30.2% yes for the 7-9 year group to 25.7% yes for the 4-6 year group.

Those who have moved recently to the county were also the least likely to respond with no, with 47.1% choosing no from the three years or fewer group. The other four groups ranged in their no responses between 58.9% (4-6 years) to 64.6% (7-9 years).

It seems logical that those who were the most not sure about how to answer the question were those who have lived here the shortest amount of time, with the three years or fewer group choosing this option at 18.9%. The group least likely to choose not sure was the 7-9 year group at 5.2%, with all other groups answering not sure at similar rates, between 10.9% and 15.4%.
Overall
While the overall response shows that the slight majority of people — 50.5% — selected yes, the county should adopt building codes, when analyzed by groups, it becomes apparent this is not a clear-cut issue.

The no responses were about one-third (33.3%), and the not sure responses were at 16.2%. Added together, the county is essentially split 50/50 on this issue.

By residential location
The city dwellers were the most likely to choose yes, with 68.6%. In comparison, those in the urban growth area selected yes at only 38.5%, and those in the rural, unincorporated areas were at 34.9% yes.

The no responses were the highest percentage among rural respondents, at 49.1%, with a similar response rate from those in the urban growth area of 45.7% no.

The not sure responses were nearly identical in all three groups: 16.1% from those in cities, 15.8% of those in the urban growth areas, and 16% of the rural respondents.
Those in the largest cities were the most likely to support building codes, with 65.7% of those in Leavenworth and 61% of those in Lansing choosing yes. The idea is also well accepted in Tonganoxie (56.9%), Basehor (49%), and Bonner Springs (45.7%), but less accepted in Linwood (32.7%) or Easton (22.2%).

Thus, the largest percentage of no responses came from Linwood (59.2%) and Easton (56.6%). The smallest no responses were from Leavenworth (20.2%), Lansing (22%), and Tonganoxie (26.9%), and Basehor (33.3%). (Note: Again, keep in mind that only 49 people from Linwood and 18 people from Easton completed this survey question, so the results can easily be skewed by a small number of people with strong views.)

Not sure responses were highest in Easton (22.2%), Basehor (17.8%), and Bonner Springs (17.1%), with Linwood having the lowest rate at 8.2%.

Table 16: Should the county adopt building codes (by city)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By age
Older residents were much more likely to support building codes than younger residents were. Those in their 60s said yes at 62.4%, 70s at 65.8%, and 80+ at 69.6%. Those in the younger four groups consistently chose yes at rates between 43.3% (40s) and 48.1% (30s).

The largest no responses came from respondents in their 40s (40.2% no, just slightly less than the 43.3% who chose yes). The other two younger groups had responses between 33.2% (30s) and 39.5% (29 and younger).

Not sure responses were highest among those in their 30s (18.7%), and lowest among those in their 70s (11%).

Table 13: Should the county adopt building codes (by age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>29 and younger</th>
<th>Age 30-39</th>
<th>Age 40-49</th>
<th>Age 50-59</th>
<th>Age 60-69</th>
<th>Age 70-79</th>
<th>Age 80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By length of residence

Those who have most recently moved to the county are the most adamant that building codes are needed, with 57.6% of those who have moved to the county in the past three years choosing yes. (This should be taken into consideration if it is a goal of the county to attract new residents to purchase housing.)

Those who have lived in the county 4-6 years were the second highest yes responders at 55.4%. However, the difference between the highest and the lowest percentages was fairly narrow compared to other questions on this survey, indicating general agreement on the question across the groups.

The respondents who have lived in the county seven years or longer answered the question yes on average between 47.9% and 49.1%.

Who chose no? The highest rate of respondents choosing no was among those who have lived here 7-9 years, at 36.5%, and the lowest rate was from those who have lived in the county three years or fewer, at 25.7%. Again, there is little difference between low and high.

Likewise, the not sure rates were very consistent, with the highest being 18.6% of people who have lived in the county 10-19 years, and the lowest being 15.3% of those who have lived in the county 20+ years.

This seems to be an issue in need of additional community discussion and analysis before the commission will have a clear direction as to citizens’ wishes.
The survey in 2007 found that 63.6% of respondents supported building codes. In 2019, only 50.5% chose this answer. But again, this was a much larger survey respondent pool (77 respondents compared to 1,921), making it a much more valid result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How old are you?

Overall
The age diversity of survey respondents was vast, especially given that a significant number of people under 30 took the time to participate — this is not always the case in community research projects.

See the graph for the complete breakdown, but the ages of respondents are well distributed, making a natural bell curve, with the largest groups being in their 40s and 50s, and the smaller groups both older and younger.

By residential location
The following points explore how respondents cluster in the county by age:

- The largest age cohort of respondents living within city limits is in their 30s (25.9%), and from there, as people age, the percentage decreases in each decade of life.

- The largest age cohort of respondents living in the urban growth areas is in their 40s and 50s (27.9% and 25.2% respectively), which likely reflects residents who are more established in their careers and families moving to newer, often larger, homes at the edges of communities.

- For the rural respondents, the largest age groups are those in their 50s and 60s at 29% and 26%. It can be presumed that this reflects those later in life wanting a more peaceful, rural lifestyle, and/or those who live on or have inherited a family property or farm.
By city

Because this is a voluntary survey — meaning that it was not sent to every household or a random sample of households in the county — concrete conclusions cannot be drawn about the population breakdown of each city from this data. However, survey respondent demographics by age were compared with census data, and that exercise provided a fair amount of confidence in its results.

The accuracy of the survey’s age demographics were checked as follows: Each city’s overall median age was looked up at Data USA and determined whether each city was older or younger than the median age of a Kansas resident (36.2).

The Olsson team wanted to explore how accurately the survey’s demographics properly reflect the actual age demographics of each city’s population. Basehor’s actual median age (36.3) is about the same as the state average age of 36.2, so it was treated as the baseline. The actual median age of Leavenworth, Tonganoxie, and Linwood is younger than Basehor’s, while the actual median age of Lansing, Bonner Springs, and Easton is older.

Because the survey’s age data was reported by decades, the closest analysis can come to isolating those older and younger than 36.2 is by breaking out those 39 and younger from the whole. Therefore, analysis isolated the percentage of each city's participants who were 39 and younger to see how that number compared to the census data, using Basehor as an average.

Linwood, Leavenworth and Tonganoxie all have younger populations and the percentage of their population 39 and younger (in blue) was also greater than Basehor’s average (in yellow).

The reverse was also true in Lansing, Bonner Springs, and Easton, which all have an older-than-average median age than Basehor does. The percentage of their survey participants age 39 or younger was less than Basehor’s.

While this method is not perfect, it shows that, in general, the age trend of our data reflects the expected age trend of the county’s population.
Table 14: City median age compared to survey respondent’s ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparable Data</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median age from datausa.io</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/- Kansas median age of 36.2</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger, older, or average median age of city’s population (according to census data) compared to state median of 36.2</td>
<td>YOUNGER</td>
<td>YOUNGER</td>
<td>YOUNGER</td>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>OLDER</td>
<td>OLDER</td>
<td>OLDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who reported they were 39 years or younger in our survey</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>17.1%*</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>22.2%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If we had achieved more overall participants from Bonner Springs and Easton, the age breakdown probably would have more appropriately reflected the overall median age of those cities.
By length of residence
How long respondents had lived in the county by age was compared and found that those respondents who had lived the longest in the county were the oldest. The total percentage of respondents age 40 and older was looked at, and found that the percentage grew progressively in correlation with how long someone had lived in the county.

Table 15: Respondents’ age compared to length of residence in county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 Years or Less</th>
<th>4-6 Years</th>
<th>7-9 Years</th>
<th>10-19 Years</th>
<th>20+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage age 40 or older</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your gender? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall

More women participated in this survey than men, at 53.2% versus 41.9%. Another 4.9% of respondents selected prefer not to answer on the gender question.

However, when looking at the demographics for Leavenworth County on Data USA, the county itself has a slightly larger percentage of men than women, which is unusual. Census.gov reports that Leavenworth County is only about 46.8% female, lower than the national average of 50.8%.

Therefore, having more women take this survey than men means the gender disparity of our respondents is not quite in line with the county’s actual demographics, but is on trend with what is typically seen in surveys. Had the county actually had more women than men, there may have been an even greater difference between the number of men and women who participated.

Regardless, when analyzing how gender impacted the survey results, little difference was found in how men and women answered the questions. Therefore, findings by gender were not broken out in this report.
Table 16: Respondents gender breakdown by city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By residential location

When looking at the gender breakdown for respondents who lived within the city limits, the discrepancy between men and women was even greater, with men being 40.7% of participants, women 56.1%, and prefer not to answer representing 3.2% of responses.

In the urban growth area, men were 43.8% of participants and women were 50.4%. The breakdown was about the same in the rural areas, with 43.7% of men and 50.4% of women. For both groups, the percentage who chose prefer not to answer was higher than in the cities, at 5.9%.

By city

The percentage of respondents who were men and women varied greatly by community, without any identifiable rhyme or reason. In all communities, women who took the survey outnumbered the men, except in Lansing.

By age

In all age groups, women outnumbered men. The age group with the smallest percentage of men was age 60-69 at 37.5%, followed by age 30-39 at 38.8%.

By length of residence

The percentage of men versus women varied by how long someone had lived in the county. There was an approximate 20% difference between the number of women and men who have lived in the county three years or fewer and 7-9 years. Of those who have lived in the county 20+ years, the percentage of respondents who were women was significantly greater than men (52.1% women versus 42.5% men, with 5.5% prefer not to answer).
**Q18. What is your employment status best described as?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall**
By and large, participants in this survey were either employed (68.4%) or retired (23.3%). There were 23 individuals who wrote in that they were self-employed or business owners in the other option, which made up 2.6% of the total responses.

**By city**
The percentage of respondents who said they were employed ranged from 61% in Easton to 77% in Bonner Springs.

It is worth noting that the percentage of participants who were retired varied greatly by city and was in line with other demographic trends. Linwood, the city with the youngest median age, had the smallest percentage of retirees (20%), and Easton, with the oldest population, had the largest percentage of retirees (38.9%).
By age
The employment status of respondents by age seems to reflect traditional cultural norms:

- In the 29 and younger group, 77.8% were employed, 8.3% were students, and 11.1% caregivers.
- In the 30-39 group, 85.6% were employed and 9.5% caregivers.
- In the 40-49 group, 92.3% were employed and 3.0% caregivers.
- In the 50-59 group, 79.5% were employed, 11.6% were retired, and 3.4% were caregivers.
- In the 60-69 group, we had 36.6% employed, 59.7% retired, and 1.6% caregivers.
- In the 70-79 group, there were 11.6% employed, 86.5% retired, and 0% caregivers.
- In the 80+ group, 95.7% were retired and 4.4% supplied an other response.

By length of residence
When we looked at employment versus the length of residence, the percentage of respondents who were employed was consistently in the 72%-78% range, except for in the 20+ years group. The 20+ years group had the largest percentage of retired participants (30.9%); all other groups had 10%-15% of respondents who were retired.
Q19. How long have you lived in Leavenworth County?

**How long have you lived in Leavenworth County?**

- Three years or less: 10%
- 4 to 6 years: 9.1%
- 7 to 9 years: 5%
- 10 to 19 years: 20.5%
- 20+ years: 54.6%
- I don't live in Leavenworth County: 0.8%

**Overall**
The analysis of this question showed us that the majority of respondents have lived in the county more than 20 years, and more than 70% have lived in the county more than 10 years. However, there are also a fairly significant number of respondents (10%) who have lived in the county three years or fewer.
**Your NEWEST residents most likely live within a city.**

**By residential location**
This data shows us that people who have moved to the county most recently are most likely locating their homes inside the city limits of an existing city. Of those who live within a city, 14.2% have lived in the county three years or fewer. Nearly half (49.1%) have lived in the county 20+ years, and another 21% have lived in the county 10-19 years.

When those respondents who live in the urban growth area are examined closely, we see that their migration to the county has been less recent. Only 7.5% have moved to the county in the past three years; however, 52.4% have lived in the county 20+ years, and another 25% have lived in the county 10-19 years.

Respondents living in rural, unincorporated areas are only 6.3% likely to have moved to the county in the past three years, but 65.2% are likely to have lived in the county 20+ years, and another 16.4% are likely to have lived in the county 10-19 years.
By city
This data can be used to determine how many respondents are living in particular cities of the county in relation to how long they have lived there, helping to track which area new residents to the county are moving to. Of those who participated in the survey, we found that Basehor has the most new residents and Easton the fewest.

The areas of the county where respondents have lived the longest include Easton (61.1%), Lansing (60.6%), and Leavenworth (58.6%), but all of these cities have a significant population of 20+ year residents.

Table 17: Length of residence by city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Leavenworth</th>
<th>Lansing</th>
<th>Tonganoxie</th>
<th>Basehor</th>
<th>Linwood</th>
<th>Bonner Springs</th>
<th>Easton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: Length of residence by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>29 and younger</th>
<th>Age 30-39</th>
<th>Age 40-49</th>
<th>Age 50-59</th>
<th>Age 60-69</th>
<th>Age 70-79</th>
<th>Age 80+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By age*

When how long people have lived in the county by age is analyzed, much can be learned about the age most new residents are when they move to the county. Notice how many of residents who have lived in the county less than a year or 1-3 years are in their 20s and 30s. The percentage of people who moved to the county during their 40s and 50s decreases considerably (with only about 8% of respondents in these age groups moving to the county in the past three years, compared to around 20% of those in their 20s and 30s). There is little evidence of new people 60+ moving to the county in the past three years, with the exception of an increase in the adults 80+ who moved to the county 1-3 years ago.4

When marketing the county to new residents (again, assuming this is a county goal), it makes the most sense to focus on quality of life aspects that appeal to young adults and families. If recruiting more retirees is a goal, then more work needs to be done to highlight assets that appeal to older adults.

---

4We wonder if there was an event such as the opening of a new retirement community that spurred a larger than normal number of older adults to move to the county around 2016.
Length of residence

In 2019, we used more narrow options than in 2007 to more closely pinpoint how long respondents had lived in the county; however, when we group the options as closely as possible, we see the percentages were fairly consistent between surveys. Overall, in 2019 there was slightly more people who have lived in the County 20+ years than who participated in 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>+/- Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years and 6-10 years combined compared to three years or less, 4-6 years, and 7-9 years combined</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years and 16-20 years combined compared to 10-19 years</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>+4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>