



Linking Environmental and Transportation Planning Advisory Group

Monday, March 9, 10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
MARC Board Room
Rivergate Center, 600 Broadway, Kansas City, MO

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions.
2. Presentation: Shockey Consulting Services will provide an update on MARC's Eco-Logical project and strategies discussed to-date for possible inclusion in the draft *Linking Environmental and Transportation Planning Action Plan*.
3. Presentation: MARC's GIS staff will present information regarding merged regional natural resource, transportation, and land use data.
4. Update on the development of *Transportation Outlook 2040*.
5. Other Business.
6. Up-coming Event:
Eco-Logical Workshop #4, Action Plan Implementation: April 10th, 10 am – 1:30pm.

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

3/9/09

1. Introductions.

Group members introduced themselves.

2. Eco-Logical Presentation.

Carla Dods and Sheila Shockey provided an update on MARC's Eco-Logical project, including action items and best practices identified via the Eco-Logical workshops for possible inclusion in the draft *Linking Environmental and Transportation Planning Action Plan*. These items have been categorized into one of three areas: policies/plans, processes/procedures, or implementation. An exercise to initially prioritize items by placing dots next to 8 of the 17 items was explained to the group.

- Ron McLinden asked Sheila to provide additional information on the exercise, including a common definition of each item to be prioritized.
- Mark Stuecheli would have liked for the items under consideration to have gone out prior to the meeting. He would also like clarification on the items.
- Sheila further explained the exercise and said that, for those who aren't comfortable determining priorities today, she will develop and send out an electronic survey version of the exercise, which will include additional explanation and details.
- Jennifer Delisle said that some key people weren't able to attend today, and it would be good to get their feedback via the survey.
- Steve Petrehn asked if items not selected as priorities today will be eliminated from the list.
- Sheila said that items will not be eliminated – We're identifying which items are garnering energy; i.e. which items are the most important ones in which to invest energy during the April 10 Eco-Logical work session.
- Tom Gerend noted that the advisory group was formed to be an advisory resource during the Eco-Logical project and to inform the environmental linkage in the long-range transportation plan (LRTP).
- It was suggested by a participant that, for those who are comfortable with the prioritization exercise, they should go ahead and conduct the exercise today. For everyone else, they can fill out the forthcoming electronic survey.
- Sheila further clarified each item under consideration and asked for additional questions.
- Ron M. asked if the items could be re-worded to have parallel construction; i.e. each item should begin with an action word.
- Jerry Shechter had a question regarding the memorandum of understanding (MOU). He asked with whom and between whom the MOUs would be conducted.
- Steve P. asked about the stakeholder meetings. He said that these could be a way in which to institutionalize inter-agency cooperation, in addition to MOUs.
- Mark S. said that he can see all of the items as being priorities, and he emphasized that he would have liked to have received a listing of the items before the meeting.
- The group conducted the prioritization exercise, and Sheila agreed to send out an electronic survey to the group within a week or so. [Follow up note: Electronic survey was not sent

out, as it was noted that all items are of equal important – Revised Draft Action Plan, which incorporates these items, will be sent to April 10 work session participants prior to work session.]

3. GIS Data Presentation.

Brian Parr, MARC's GIS Program Manager, presented information regarding merged regional natural resource, transportation, and land use data. He said that the questions to be answered by this project had not fully been defined, and that we are starting by looking at what we can learn from this merged data.

- Ron M. asked if the buffers placed around roadway projects indicated distances from centerlines. Brian said yes.
- Dale Crawford said that there should be different buffer widths for different project types.
- David Peel said that the buffer widths will also vary depending on what impacts you're trying to capture; i.e. noise, dust, etc... May need to have multiple width zones for each project.
- Participant asked if the population data is based on existing population. Brian said that it is based on population data from the year 2000.
- Tom G. said that the Technical Forecast Committee's (TFC) work includes future population distribution by parcel. He said we will need to examine whether there's benefit in keeping the population component of this project, since that work is being conducting by the TFC and is feeding into the transportation model. Regarding starting this project by looking at the data first and then determining the questions to be answered, he said that MARC has never before looked at what meaningful merged transportation/environmental analysis could be conducted to inform and engage the public during the LRTP process. He didn't want to define the solution without going through this process first.
- Participant noted that the type of nearby construction project(s), if any, within the zone could assist in identifying the width of the zone.
- Helene Miller said that, in addition to human transportation needs, there are wildlife transportation needs; i.e. deer crossings. This project should identify help inform these areas.
- Jerry S. asked if the assumption is that every dot showing a stream/roadway intersection is reality. Brian said that the streams are generated via software – When the aeriels are overlaid on this layer, they don't always match up.
- Wendy Sangster said that the dot implies that the impact is only at the intersection. The impact is much greater. Brian walked through a demonstration, showing stream impacts not only at the source, but also downstream from the source point.
- Jennifer Delisle asked if the streams are ephemeral or perennial. Brian said he wasn't sure.
- Brian said that his main priorities moving forward are to clarify streams and habitat data, and to add a parks layer.
- Participant asked if it is conceivable to drill down to the digital photography level with stream data. Brian said yes.
- Interested participants were asked to talk with Brian afterwards if they are interested in being part of continued data discussions.

4. Up-coming Event.

Eco-Logical Workshop #4, Implementation Framework: April 10, 10 am – 1:30 pm.