

IV. IMPLEMENTATION



A. IMPLEMENTATION OBJECTIVES

It is the intent of this plan to allow flexibility in the redevelopment of the Arena Neighborhood, while at the same time providing valuable guidance for public and private investment decision-making well into the future. In previous sections of this plan, a number of key objectives point to the need to have a redevelopment organization and various standards of development in order to create the vibrant urban experience of a successful place, such as that envisioned for the Arena Neighborhood area.

To support those objectives it is important to have an implementation framework or approach that will guide decision-making and implementation actions in the future.

Success requires a paradigm shift. Successful redevelopment of the Arena Neighborhood area will require creativity. The community will need to look toward the creation and use of new and unique policy, program and financial tools and methods to effectively redevelop the area. Given the amount of public investment in the area and the complexity of downtown

IMPLEMENTATION OBJECTIVES

- Success requires a paradigm shift.
- Remain flexible to adjust for changing market conditions.
- Know when to say “no”.
- Demand quality development that can be sustained.

redevelopment, and the importance of a healthy downtown to sustaining the health and identity of a community, this is this right place in Wichita to implement such a paradigm shift. Several recommendations and strategies in this plan will be challenging to accomplish, but without doing so, the area will languish and will not achieve its full economic development potential.

Remain flexible to adjust for changing market conditions.

Redevelopment of the area is a long-term proposition. Plan implementation will need to be monitored, evaluated and adjusted within the context of market changes over time. Success of the plan and the area will be determined by how well the plan, the development and citizens can adapt to these changes.

Know when to say “no”. Determinations will need to be made in a manner that takes into account not only the existing context and condition but also the anticipated future. When considering development proposals a “no” decision in the short-term may be painful, but it may also be the right thing to do in light of an anticipated change in condition on the development horizon and maximizing the return on public investment in the area.

Demand quality development that can be sustained. As part of downtown, development in the area should be held to the highest standard, but it should not be prohibited by costly requirements. Buildings and aesthetic improvements should be designed and built to last for long periods of time, as well as be adaptable to future reuse. Downtown is the heart of the community and many public investments are expected to last a lifetime or longer. The same should be true of private development. Within a downtown, development is not just about a short-term economic but also about the legacy of what one generation will leave to the next within a community.

These general objectives set the tone for pursuing the plan vision through a series of implementation actions that address policy, program and physical improvement strategies. The following Implementation Matrix contained in this section outlines necessary actions and anticipated timelines related to the plan implementation progress.

B. PUBLIC / PRIVATE INVESTMENT ANALYSIS

The purpose of the Public/Private Investment Analysis is to do a marco-level comparative analysis of the potential level of public and private investment that may be made through the implementation of the Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan. This is a very general and conservative analysis based on several assumptions that must be understood.

The focus of the public investment portion of the analysis is the major components of street and streetscaping improvements and the provision of public parking recommended in the Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan. For this portion of the analysis, costs were taken from recent projects in Wichita, as well as accepted practice estimated amounts, and inflated slightly. In regard to private investment, a build-out scenario using only existing vacant and surface parking parcels in the Plan Area was developed and assigned an average investment number per square foot. This estimate intentionally does not account for redevelopment of existing buildings, renovation of existing properties or conversion of uses as a result of private investment.

From those general parameters, a private investment to public investment ratio was derived which should be an underestimate of private investment in the area and an overestimate of public investment in the area in order to gauge the potential aggregate investment to be achieved within the Plan Area and its identified Districts.

Public Investment

The recommended public investment discussed in the analysis refers to the above ground functional upgrade and aesthetic improvements to the existing streets and streetscaping within the Plan Area. Essentially, the figure used per linear foot is an inflated number based upon complete reconstruction of roadways in the area. Even though this is not necessarily the recommendation of the plan, doing this can make accommodation for other possible public investments in infrastructure and administration that cannot be estimated at this time. (It should be noted that Waterman has been removed from this analysis due to status of improvements being designed and planned currently.)

The recommended street improvements have been classified into three separate categories; Plaza, Pedestrian and Balanced. The classifications differ based on design criteria and engineering standards (See Figure III-4 for street classifications).

Figure IV-1 lists the number of linear roadway feet per District, per street classification. There are 24,836 linear feet of existing roadway recommended for street and streetscaping improvements within the Plan Area, surrounding the arena site. A general cost estimate of \$1,300 per linear foot has been applied to the aggregate number of linear feet. The median linear foot cost was based on a series of contractor estimates given for similar street and streetscaping improvements in and around the downtown Wichita area. As a result, it is estimated that roughly \$32.3 million in public investment would occur in the form of street and streetscaping improvements.

Public Investment (Street and Streetscape Improvements in linear feet)					
Cost Per Linear Foot of Roadway = \$1,300					
	Plaza	Pedestrian	Balanced	Total	X Linear Foot Cost
Douglas Street Corridor	371	946	3,370	4,687	\$6,093,100
English / William Street District	2,455	3,918	3,397	9,770	\$12,701,000
Broadway District	0	4,412	3,325	7,737	\$10,058,100
Commerce Street Arts District	2,642	0	0	2,642	\$3,434,600
Total	5,468	9,276	10,092	24,836	
X Linear Foot Cost	\$7,108,400	\$12,058,800	\$13,119,600		\$32,286,800

Figure IV-1: Public Investment
Source: Gould Evans

Private Investment

The *Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan* depicts a future redevelopment strategy for the Plan Area. This analysis estimated that within the Plan Area roughly 3.75 million square feet of new building space could be developed within the framework set by the Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan. This figure of 3.75 million was determined by identifying the developable parcels within the Plan Area. Developable parcels are either existing surface parking or vacant lots. Probable building

Private Investment (Building Construction = Residential, Commercial, Office, Mixed-Use)			
Development Cost Per Square Foot = \$125			
District	Total Sq Footage Capacity (minus 7% public space)	Buildable Sq Footage (minus ramp parking)	X Development Cost
Douglas Street Corridor	281,814	166,270	\$20,783,750
English / William Street District	1,846,830	1,089,630	\$136,203,750
Broadway District	1,498,584	859,644	\$107,455,500
Commerce Street Arts District	125,063	73,788	\$9,223,500
Total	3,752,291	2,189,332	\$273,666,500

Figure IV-2: Private Investment
Source: Gould Evans

footprints were then determined for each developable parcel (allotting for 7% public on-site public space). The Plan identifies a range of the number of floors allowed on each half-block within the Plan Area. The low end of each floor range was applied toward each previously determined building footprint. *Figure IV-2* shows the total square footage capacity for the four Districts in addition to the entire Study Area. Figure IV-2 also lists the buildable square footage of 2.19 million for the Plan Area. This sum was determined by subtracting the square footage needed to meet parking standards away from the total capacity (The parking methodology is explained in detail in the following sub-section Parking Investment).

N A S H V I L L E C O U N T Y G O V E R N M E N T
 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
 1000 MARKET STREET, SUITE 200
 NASHVILLE, TN 37203
 TEL: 615-252-3300 FAX: 615-252-3301
 WWW.NASHVILLEGOV.COM

Based on area real estate statistics, a median development cost of \$125 per square foot was determined. The median cost is a composite comprised of averages of various residential, commercial and office development costs. By applying the median development cost of \$125 to the buildable square footage of 2.19 million square feet, an estimate of roughly \$274 million worth of capacity for private investment was determined.

Parking Investment

Off-street parking has been isolated in this analysis because the investment in such parking can be accounted for using a variety of payment methodologies (two methodologies are provided in the summary section of this report). It is assumed that on-street parking in the Plan Area will be maximized and is part of the public investment made as streets are reconstructed. Also, there is an assumption that all off-street parking will be in parking structures – except for some residential and retail uses in the Broadway Neighborhood and Commerce Street Arts Districts.

For off-street parking elsewhere within the Plan Area, a modified parking ratio was applied based on the urban setting that would include on-street parking and shared parking arrangements for both public and private uses. The parking ratio utilized for parking in this scenario is 1 parking ramp space for every 500 square feet of new development that occurs. One parking lot space for every 250 square feet of new development was used for the proposed surface parking to be located adjacent to Kellogg in the Broadway Neighborhood District. General parking studies cite 350 square feet is typically needed for one parking spot. Thus, for every 500 square feet of new development 350 square feet of additional development is needed to accommodate parking. This parking standard can be expressed in the ratio of 0.41 or 350/850.

The result is 1.56 million square feet of parking will be needed to support the capacity of new development (see *Figure IV-3*). Assuming that the existing on and off-street parking is reserved by the current residents and tenants in the Plan Area, a total of 4,465 additional parking spots (4,227 ramp and 238 surface) would be needed to supply the 2.19 million square feet of development capacity.

Parking Investment				
Parking = 1 Parking Spot/500 Sq Ft (ramp)		Development Cost/Parking Ramp Spot = \$17,500		
Parking = 1 Parking Spot/250 Sq Ft (surface lot)		Development Cost/Parking Lot Spot = \$5,000		
District	Allotted Parking Sq Footage	Parking Ramp Spots Needed	Parking Lot Spots Needed	X Development Cost
Douglas Street Corridor	115,544	330	0	\$5,775,000
English / William Street District	757,200	2,163	0	\$37,852,500
Broadway District	638,940	1,587	238	\$28,962,500
Commerce Street Arts District	51,276	147	0	\$2,572,500
Total	1,562,960	4,227	238	\$75,162,500

Figure IV-3: Parking Investment

Source: Gould Evans

As a general rule, one off-street ramp parking spot costs roughly \$17,500 and one off-street surface parking spot costs roughly \$5,000 to construct. Therefore, it is estimated that a \$75 million investment is needed to provide sufficient off-street parking.

Summary

The return on investment for public dollars is greatly impacted by the cost of the provision of off-street parking required to serve the estimated development capacity recommended in the *Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan*. If the public is required to finance 100% of the off-street parking requirements in addition to the street and streetscaping investment, the total public investment would exceed \$107 million. At this cost, the City of Wichita would see approximately 2.55 private dollars invested for every 1.00 dollar of public investment (See **Figure IV-4**) in the arena neighborhood area.

Return on Investment (ROI)					
Off-Street Parking - 100% Public Investment					
District	Potential Private Investment	Public Investment (Streets)	Off-Street Parking Investment	Private - Public	ROI per \$1 Invested
Douglas Street Corridor	\$20,783,750	\$6,093,100	\$5,775,000	\$8,915,650	\$1.75
English / William Street District	\$136,203,750	\$12,701,000	\$37,852,500	\$85,650,250	\$2.69
Broadway District	\$107,455,500	\$10,058,100	\$28,962,500	\$68,434,900	\$2.75
Commerce Street Arts District	\$9,223,500	\$3,434,600	\$2,572,500	\$3,216,400	\$1.54
Total	\$273,666,500	\$32,286,800	\$75,162,500	\$166,217,200	\$2.55

Figure IV-4: Return on Investment – Off-Street parking financed 100% by public
 Source: Gould Evans

If off-street parking were a shared cost the amount of private investment to public would change dramatically. **Figure IV-5** assumes that a joint public/private venture to finance the off-street parking would be implemented. This assumed venture would redistribute approximately \$38 million of the off-street parking cost to private, thereby raising the aggregate investment ratio of 4.45 private dollars for every 1.00 dollar of public investment for the arena neighborhood area.

Return on Investment (ROI)						
Off-Street Parking - 50% Public Investment / 50% Private Investment						
District	Potential Private Investment	Private Off-Street Parking	Public Investment (Streets)	Public Off-Street Parking	Private - Public	ROI per \$1 Invested
Douglas Street Corridor	\$20,783,750	\$2,887,500	\$6,093,100	\$2,887,500	\$14,690,650	\$2.64
English / William Street District	\$136,203,750	\$18,926,250	\$12,701,000	\$18,926,250	\$123,502,750	\$4.90
Broadway District	\$107,455,500	\$14,481,250	\$10,058,100	\$14,481,250	\$97,397,400	\$4.97
Commerce Street Arts District	\$9,223,500	\$1,286,250	\$3,434,600	\$1,286,250	\$5,788,900	\$2.23
Total	\$273,666,500	\$37,581,250	\$32,286,800	\$37,581,250	\$241,379,700	\$4.45

Figure IV-5: Return on Investment – Off-Street parking financed 50% by public, 50% by private

Source: Gould Evans

C. MATRIX

The decisions that put the plan into action come from a variety of sources – both public and private – and from a variety of perspectives – regulatory, fiscal, and strategic. The following strategies are intended to guide the implementation of the Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan in pursuit of the identified vision.

The strategies in the matrix are the direct result of an assessment of the overall vision, district goals and objectives in the plan. As such, the strategies are organized into the four districts of the plan area: **Douglas Street Corridor District, English / William Street District, Broadway Neighborhood District and Commerce Street Arts District**. To address those items that encompass the neighborhood as a whole a **Neighborhood** category has been included in the matrix. For each strategy implementation phasing and responsibility are assigned.

There are three suggested phases: Short Term (0-5 years), Medium Term (5-10 years) and Long Term (10+ years). For those strategies that should become everyday policies or practices of the City and others, an “on-going” category has been established. Additionally, strategies that should be

accomplished prior to the opening of the arena are identified by an **asterisk (*)** signifying a 0-2 year time frame.

The public / private investment analysis yielded cost estimates that identify broad development and public costs associated with redevelopment of the Arena Neighborhood. Included in the matrix are the estimated infrastructure (public) costs based on improvement costs of a similar nature. These are conservative macro-level estimates that can serve as a guide to the level of investment to be made in the Arena Neighborhood area.

Additionally, the responsibility for implementing each particular strategy is assigned using the following code:

- (COW) City of Wichita (staff, elected officials, transit, etc.)
- (SC) Sedgwick County
- (IA) Implementation Agency
- (WDDC) Wichita Downtown Development Corporation
- (D/LO) Developers and land owners
- (B/I) Businesses, industries, and business and industry organizations
- (C) Citizens

In situations where multiple entities are given responsibility for the implementation of a strategy the lead entity has been **bolded**.