

ATTACHMENT # 1

TITLE: Updated Worksession/Briefing Schedule.

**Intercounty Connector Environmental Impact Study
Planning Board Worksession Schedule**

May 13, 2004 DRAFT

Prior SHA Activities

- Scoping Public Open Houses; June 2003
- Alternatives Public Workshops; November 13, 15, and 19, 2003

County Council Activities

- Comment on ARDS per November Public Workshops; December 1, 2003

Worksession #1 – January 22, 2004 (2.0 hours – no public testimony)- COMPLETED

Topics:

- Review ICC Study Background and Schedule
- Review Draft Alternates Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS)
- Review County Council Comments on ARDS
- Review 1989 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with SHA re: parkland impacts
- Review M-NCPPC staff involvement in SHA study

Interim SHA Activities

- ARDS selection, February 2004

Worksession #2 – March 4, 2004 (1.5 hours – no public testimony)-COMPLETED

“Property Owner” topics

- Staff proposal defining how “equal quality” parkland will be assessed per MOU (Hench)
- Means by which park owner statements can influence Section 4(f) impacts analysis (SHA)

“Planning / Zoning Authority” topics

- Review proposed worksession schedule (Valladares)
- Confirmation that Planning Board process dovetails with SHA process (SHA)
- Update on selected ARDS package (SHA), response to Council / Board comments

Interim SHA Activities

- Draft Environmental Stewardship materials, March 2004
- Expert Land Use Panel Analysis Findings, June 2004
- Draft Travel Demand Analysis materials, April 2004
- Draft Cultural Resources Effects materials, May 2004

- Preliminary Draft Socioeconomic and Land Use Technical Report, 10 May 2004.
- Preliminary Draft Noise Quality Technical Report, 10 May 2004.
- Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation materials, May 2004

Worksession #3 – June 3, 2004 (2 hours – no public testimony)	
“Property Owner” topics	“Planning / Zoning Authority” topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of SHA Draft Section 4(f) Impacts report • Staff proposal for candidate replacement parklands that would satisfy MOU (Hench) • Staff proposal for Section 4(f) impacts analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review proposed worksession schedule (Valladares) • Review SHA’s interim draft technical report findings (Edwards? / Hardy / Federline / Hench) • Review Environmental Stewardship process and findings (Sandberg) • Staff proposal for policy guidance on balancing natural / cultural / community resource protection and enhancement

Interim SHA Activities

- Public Workshops, late Spring 2004
- Draft Natural Environmental materials, June 2004
- Draft Air Quality materials, June 2004

Worksession #4 – July 15, 2004 (4 hours)	
Include Public Testimony on Staff Recommendations	
“Property Owner” topics	“Planning / Zoning Authority” topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Board comment to SHA on staff proposals for MOU and candidate replacement parkland • Planning Board position on Section 4(f) minimization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review proposed worksession schedule (Valladares) • Planning Board comment to SHA on staff proposals for policy guidance on balancing natural / cultural / community resource protection and enhancement • Review SHA’s interim technical report findings (Bunnag / Hekimian?) • Review Environmental Stewardship process and findings (Sandberg)

Interim SHA Activities

- DEIS publication, October 2004

- Location and Design Public Hearings, December 2004

Worksession #5 – November December 2, 2004 (2 hours – no public testimony)	
“Property Owner” topics	“Planning / Zoning Authority” topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff proposal on parkland mitigation concepts for inclusion in FEIS (both Corridor 1 and Corridor 2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review proposed worksession schedule (Valladares) • Review DEIS summary of findings • Planning Board comment on additional supplementary information requested of staff for Worksession #6

Worksession #6 – January 20, 2005 (4 hours)	
Include Public Testimony on Staff Recommendations	
“Property Owner” topics	“Planning / Zoning Authority” topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Board comment to SHA on staff proposals for parkland mitigation concepts for staff recommended selected alternate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review proposed worksession schedule (Valladares) • Planning Board Comment on staff recommendation for selected alternate

Interim SHA Activities

- Draft FEIS preparation, March 2005

Worksession #7 – March 24, 2005 (2 hours – no public testimony)	
“Property Owner” topics	“Planning / Zoning Authority” topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss status of parkland mitigation with SHA staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review proposed worksession schedule (Valladares)

Interim SHA Activities

- FEIS publication, April 2005
- FHWA Record of Decision (ROD), June 2005

Worksession #8 – June 30, 2005 (2 hours – no public testimony)	
“Property Owner” topics	“Planning / Zoning Authority” topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss status of parkland mitigation with SHA staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review proposed worksession schedule (Valladares)

--	--

Subsequent Planning Board worksessions for design and construction phases to be developed as needed

Topic details

Section 4(f) analysis / influence includes:

- Indirect “constructive use” impacts
- Bike path definition as recreation vs transportation resources
- Means by which a “higher acreage” impact could be the preferred minimization alternative and how the Planning Board can influence the FHWA findings in this regard

Travel demand analysis includes:

- Accessibility
- Value pricing / toll issues
- Effect of ICC on intersections and links in study area
- Alternative interchange / truncation options

Natural environmental impact analysis includes:

- Stream crossing techniques and designs
- Stormwater management treatment considerations
- SPA considerations

“Balancing natural/cultural/community resource protection and enhancement” considers policy issues such as:

- Transportation/recreation value of bike path versus impervious surface/resource protection issues
- Support for distributing presumably scarce stewardship resources among categories

ICC Personal Archives.doc

ATTACHMENT # 2

TITLE: COG Proposed Year 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP Air Quality Conformity Schedule.

Exhibit 2

PROPOSED YEAR 2004 CLRP AND FY 2005-2010 TIP AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY SCHEDULE

*December 17, 2003	TPB Reviews Draft Solicitation Document
*January 21, 2004	TPB Releases Final Solicitation Document
February 6, 2004	DEADLINE: Implementing Agencies Complete Electronic Submissions of Project Information to staff- including CMS, CLRP, and TIP Data.
February 12, 2004	CLRP and TIP Project Submissions for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and Draft Scope of Work Released for Public Comment and Inter-Agency Review
*February 18, 2004	TPB Reviews Project Submissions and Scope of Work
March 11, 2004	Final CLRP and TIP Project Submissions for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and Draft Scope of Work Released for Public Comment and Inter-Agency Review
*March 17, 2004	TPB Reviews Public Comments Received to Date on Project Submissions for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for CLRP and TIP and Scope of Work
April 10, 2004	Public Comment Period Ends for Project Submissions and Scope of Work
April 21, 2004	TPB Reviews Public Comments, Approves Project Submissions for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for CLRP and TIP and Scope of Work
*June 16, 2004	TPB Receives Briefing on Draft Air Quality Conformity Determination, CLRP and TIP Documents
*July 21, 2004	TPB Releases Draft Air Quality Conformity Determination, Draft Year 2004 CLRP, and Draft FY 2005-2010 TIP for Public Comment and Inter-Agency Review
August 20, 2004	Public Comment Period Ends for Draft Documents
*September 15, 2004	TPB Reviews Public Comments on Draft Documents, Approves Responses to Comments, and Adopts the Air Quality Conformity Determination, the Year 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP

*TPB Meeting

ATTACHMENT # 3

TITLE: Environmental Comparison Methodology

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPARISON METHODOLOGY

Background

The building of transportation facilities will usually result in varying degrees of disturbance to natural resources. Specific environmental impacts are determined and evaluated in detail when projects are designed, using the specific engineering requirements of the project. However, prior to engineering, during the planning phase, general assumptions may be made at a screening level to determine approximate possible levels of disturbance to resources.

In order to determine the general level of disturbance associated with a transportation scenario such as the ICC, a methodology was developed using the Geographic Information System (GIS) to identify and combine selected resource impacts. The results can be used to compare the relative levels of disturbance between alternatives. The methodology depends directly on assumptions made about the location and size of the area disturbed by a proposed transportation improvement.

The GIS is a database of "layers" of information, which geographically locate various natural and built features. Each layer identifies the specific locations of unique features such as parks, wetlands, or forests. These layers, combined with the proposed location of transportation facilities can be used to determine the location and extent of individual or combined impact to such features.

A program was developed to identify and measure resource features affected by specified transportation improvements. This process requires a detailed specification of the proposed transportation facility "footprint" and a countywide layer locating with as much detail as possible all the environmental features of interest.

This is a planning level analysis and is based on many simplifying assumptions and should be used as a preliminary evaluation method. The results are generally more approximate than would be determined from individual project engineering studies and extensive environmental fieldwork. Limitations include the following:

- The location and extent impact was determined by a 300 foot road right-of-way. Areas of disturbance could change significantly if the design process reduces impacts through relocation, design and construction methods.
- Construction was assumed to be at-grade and did not account for cut and/or fill. Changes in topography can significantly increase areas of disturbance.
- The right-of-way does not capture project components such as stormwater management facilities, which create additional areas of disturbance.
- The extent of the environmental features is often more extensive than the indicators available in the GIS. Therefore this tool should be used to compare alignments rather to evaluate a single alignment.

These limitations are acceptable for a planning level review, because the measurements are primarily to be used in relative terms rather than as absolutes. They are a useful composite indicator of relative resource disturbance between the two alternatives.

ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURE DESCRIPTIONS

Sensitive Areas - a composite of the following:

- **Wetlands** - According to both federal and state wetland statutes, a wetland is an area covered or saturated by surface or ground water for a long enough period of time to support a vegetation community that typically can live and adapt to water-saturated soil conditions. Only certain plants are able to grow and thrive in such wet conditions. Also many species of animals use wetlands for some portion of their life. Other species are completely dependent on damp soils and standing pools of water for their long-term survival. Wetland impacts were defined as the amount of wetlands within the road right-of-way. This definition provides a measure of direct, physical disturbance, but does not necessarily reflect such impacts as degradation of wetland system due to fragmentation or change in hydrology in and around the wetland.
- **Floodplains** – Floodplains are low-lying areas adjacent to streams, subject to intermittent flooding. Building permits are restricted within floodplains.
- **Stream Buffers** – Stream buffers are important because they generally contain environmentally sensitive areas such as the natural stream channel, riparian forests, floodplains, wetlands and adjacent steep slopes. Alteration of these areas exacerbates watershed erosion/sedimentation and contributes significantly to water quality degradation. These are delineated by measuring a buffer of 150 feet from the outer edge of each bank of the stream.
- **Adjacent Steep Slopes** – The entirety of a slope greater than 25% that is within or partially within 200 feet of a stream channel and that drains directly to that stream.

Forest Interior - This is any portion of a 100-acre or greater forest stand that is at least 300 feet inside the outer edge of the stand. Larger forest stands contain more species diversity, provide higher levels of forest functional benefits, and have the potential to provide increasingly rare habitat for forest interior dwelling plant and animal species. Interior forest habitat losses are a combination of direct disturbance associated with a road, plus loss of interior resulting from the penetration of the forest interior and the creation of new outer forest edges, often resulting in a total loss of interior habitat exceeding direct impacts.

Park Property – Park property is property owned by either local, state or federal government, M-NCPPC, WSSC, or the Revenue Authority.

Biodiversity Areas – Areas of special biodiversity in the park system have been identified by DNR. These areas contain one or more of the following natural resources:

- Populations of rare, threatened, endangered, or watchlist plants or animals.
- Unusual or unique types of habitat.
- Examples of high quality or otherwise significant natural communities.
- Plant or animal species with importance to the county or locality.

Like Forest Interior, Biodiversity Areas are strongly related to overall size. Therefore fragmentation of these areas can result in a total area of loss that exceeds direct impacts.

Significant Natural Areas – The park system contains a wide variety of high quality natural land including some of the best natural areas remaining in the county. These areas deserve special recognition and protection. Significant natural areas in the park system have been identified based on a variety of criteria including those listed below.

- Large acreage of contiguous, high quality forest
- Rare, threatened, endangered and watchlist plants
- Biodiversity areas (as shown above)
- Unique habitats for plants and wildlife
- Wetlands of high quality (including wetlands of special state concern)
- Aquatic biological community rated good or excellent
- Special Trout Management Areas