



Linking Environmental and Transportation Planning Advisory Group

Monday, December 7, 1:30 – 3:00 p.m.
Broadway Room
600 Broadway, Kansas City, MO

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions.
2. Announcements and Up-Coming Events.
3. *Transportation Outlook 2040*.
 - Adaptive scenario.
 - Environmental considerations in the plan.
4. Memorandum of Understanding.
5. Other Business.
 - Future meeting dates.

Parking: Free parking is available when visiting MARC. Visitors and guests should park on the upper level of the garage. To enter this level from Broadway, turn west into the Rivergate Center parking lot. Please use any of the available spaces on the upper level at the top of the ramp.

Special Accommodations: Please notify the Mid-America Regional Council at (816) 474-4240 at least 48 hours in advance if you require special accommodations to attend this meeting (i.e., qualified interpreter, large print, reader, hearing assistance). We will make every effort to meet reasonable requests.

MARC programs that receive federal funding may not discriminate against anyone on the basis of race, color or national origin, according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

SUMMARY

Linking Environmental and Transportation Planning Action Plan Advisory Group

12/7/09

1. Welcome and Introductions

Lisa Pool welcomed the group. Group members introduced themselves.

2. Announcements and Up-Coming Events.

Lisa encouraged anyone in the group to contact Tom Gerend or Frank Lenk if they would like MARC staff to speak to their organization on the adaptive scenario. Staff is looking to get additional feedback on the scenario through the months of January and February. Advisory group members should also express their opinions on the scenario to their elected officials and MARC Board representatives.

**3. *Transportation Outlook 2040 (TO2040).*
Adaptive Land Use Scenario**

Tom Gerend presented information on MARC's adaptive land use scenario, which is based on the concept of focusing development in existing and planned activity centers and along transit corridors.

- Harold Draper asked how many projects were nominated for Transportation Outlook 2040. Tom said 601 projects were submitted by local cities and counties, as well as transit operators, KDOT, and MoDOT. Harold asked about review process.
- Tom G. said the nomination questions were more holistic than they have been in the past. Staff scored projects primarily using information submitted by applicants. We are working through committees to determine project priorities, by project type. He said the Technical Forecast Committee is looking at what's supportive of the adaptive land use scenario. There is not enough money to do all of the projects nominated.
- Ron McLinden said that he has been involved with the Technical Forecast Committee. The adaptive scenario is hypothetical. It's not a plan. It is somewhat rooted in reality because it is based on the assumption of increased transit use, but some activity nodes are hypothetical. The committee is highly supportive of the adaptive scenario, but it's not appealing at first blush. More than 40% of new growth should be projected as occurring in existing areas.
- Mark Stuecheli said the two scenarios (baseline and adaptive) are extremes. We have to look at what's reasonable and find a middle ground. Portland has done the most to manage growth, and this is at a 25% redevelopment rate.
- Tom G. said that the number Mark referenced occurred on previously developed property. Our figure of 40% comprises urbanized areas + vacant areas. Using those criteria, Portland's figure would be over 50%.
- Mark said the scenario is looking 40 years out, and we're already 10 years into the 40-year period. We're starting at 0, so we need to be more aggressive with implementation, which will be challenging.

- Lee Ann asked if we are really starting at zero.
- Mark emphasized that the adaptive scenario is extreme. There are substantial differences between the baseline and adaptive scenarios. To accomplish Portland's level of redevelopment, we'd need aggressive growth management policies.
- Ron Mc. said the Technical Forecast Committee presented an adaptive scenario that is short of extreme. MARC does not have the power to control local land use. The list of policies needed to achieve the adaptive scenario has not been finalized yet.
- Mark said we shouldn't call it an adaptive scenario.
- Tom Jacobs said that he attended a conference in Portland earlier this year. He met a whole team of cities doing great things to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Representatives from Portland said they are just the "leader after the first mile". Tom J. noted that the densities we are hoping to achieve in our adaptive scenario are similar to Omaha's.
- Mike Beezhold said there are not enough criteria to see which nominated projects support the adaptive scenario. We could arrive at environmental benefits by looking at what supports the natural environment, what avoids it, and what mitigates it.
- Tom G. said the challenge of the long-range plan is the lack of project definition. Many projects are conceptual. We've done some work with the environmental impact of projects this time around. This group could help with the environmental evaluation of projects during funding rounds.

Draft Environmental Chapter

Lisa provided an overview of the draft environmental chapter of TO2040 and asked for feedback.

- Mike B. said the chapter could be approached differently, with the part about the HUD-DOT-EPA Interagency Partnership going before what we're doing as a region. Pose what we're doing as necessary, in light of national and other efforts.
- Ron Mc. agrees with Mike. The chapter needs to focus on resource use, efficiency, and a pragmatic approach. There should be less emphasis on aesthetic aspects. MetroGreen is a great plan, but within the bike/ped. committee, there's a feeling that their work should focus on transportation first, then recreation second. He would like to see reduction of vehicle miles travelled (VMT) as an addition to the list of strategies. He would like to see a more VMT reduction goal in the performance measures section of the draft plan.
- Tom G. said VMT reduction has been identified as a strategy by the operations and maintenance workgroup. Elements of the plan overlap – there will be some redundancy of information.
- Ron Mc. said he didn't see as much transit reference in the environmental chapter as he'd like. He'd also like to see a more significant discussion about regional urban form – it's a crucial decision, with the greatest impact.
- Tom J. mentioned MARC's Parking Lots to Parks project and the impact of parking lots on our landscape. He said there are 60 square miles of land in parking lots in our region. We need to develop a regional parking demand analysis and determine our retail vacancy rate. Our approach to parking should fit within the redevelopment strategies we're proposing for the adaptive scenario. We need to look at economic development as it relates to retail.

- Ron Mc. said the parking lot topic appeals to him. It could be inserted into the environmental chapter. The sustainable streets section of the chapter should be broadened to include language on the importance of the connection between the street and adjacent land uses (area beyond right-of-way). We need to have places where people can walk to the store.
- Dale Crawford said his first observation about the Parking Lots to Parks project was that it has the wrong name. It should be called “Parking Lots to Rooftops” (sin both the suburbs and urban core).
- Mark S. said Olathe is working on changing their parking requirements. The city recently approved new design standards. The future is parking maximums.
- Wendy Sangster said that parking lots could be merged with the sustainable streets section in the environmental chapter.
- Mike B. said project funding criteria should be more explicitly linked with environmental requirements.
- Mark S. said that if we move forward with a regional sustainable streets program, additional conversations need to happen.
- Harold asked if more details on the list of nominated projects are available. Lisa said she can provide that list to anyone who’s interested.
- Dale asked about a project feedback period. Tom said projects were posted online for public feedback and additional feedback is being sought via MARC’s committees. The final draft project list will also be posted for general public feedback prior to adoption.

4. **Memorandum of Understanding.**

Lisa presented information on a draft memorandum of understanding, the purpose of which is to formalize on-going collaboration between agencies working on the Eco-Logical project.

- It was noted that the more basic the MOU is, the better.
- As long as the MOU doesn’t commit funding and says we’re working towards certain goals, then it will be more palatable to organizations at the table.
- Representatives of KDOT, MoDOT, Overland Park and possibly KCMO will distribute the draft MOU among their organizations to get a feel for whether they would be willing to sign it.
- It was noted that it might be beneficial to have TTPC and/or the MARC Board approval.

5. **Other Business.**

Lisa noted that future advisory group meetings will be held on a quarterly basis, on the first Monday of each third month. The next meeting is scheduled for March 1st at 1:30 pm.