



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING JUNE 16, 2009 2:00-3:30 PM COMPASS CONFERENCE ROOM

** AGENDA **

I. AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

II. OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Page 2 * A. **Approve May 19, 2009, Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

A copy of the draft May 19, 2009, Executive Committee meeting minutes is attached.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

Page 6 * A. **Establish July 21, 2009, COMPASS Board Agenda**
Staff proposed agenda items for the regularly scheduled July 21, 2009, Board meeting are attached.

Page 11 * B. **Consider Development Review Protocol**
Staff will review the draft Development Review Protocol as recommended by the Regional Technical Advisory Committee.

Page 15 * C. **Recommend Approval of Immediate Past Chair Position**
Staff will review draft language creating through amendment an Immediate Past Chair Position in the COMPASS Bylaws.

Page 17 * D. **Recommend Next Steps Following Joint COMPASS/VRT Workshop on May 18, 2009**
Staff will review notes from the joint COMPASS/VRT workshop held on May 18, 2009. Staff will seek recommended next steps for presentation to the COMPASS Board at its July 2009 meeting.

E. **Recommend Approval of Priorities for TIGER Funding Under ARRA**
Staff will review priorities for stimulus funding.

V. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. **Status Report – Project Prioritization Process**
Staff will review subcommittee recommendation on the project prioritization process.

VI. OTHER

VII. ADJOURNMENT

*Enclosures Agenda is subject to change.

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

T:\FY09\900 Operations\990 Direct Operations-Maintenance\Board\Exec\2009
agendasminutes\agenda06162009.doc



**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MAY 19, 2009
COMPASS CONFERENCE ROOM**

****MINUTES****

ATTENDEES: Phil Bandy, Mayor, City of Eagle, for Nate Mitchell, Mayor, City of Star
Dave Bieter, Mayor, City of Boise, **Chair Elect (via telephone)**
Tom Dale, Mayor, City of Nampa
Tammy de Weerd, Mayor, City of Meridian
David Ferdinand, Commissioner, Canyon County, **Vice-Chair**
Carol McKee, Commissioner, Ada County Highway District, **Secretary/Treasurer**
Garret Nancolas, Mayor, City of Caldwell, **Chair**
Matt Stoll, Executive Director, Community Planning Association, Ex officio
Fred Tilman, Commissioner, Ada County

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vicki Thurber, Mayor, City of Middleton

OTHERS PRESENT: Nancy Brecks, Community Planning Association
Ken Burgess, Veritas Advisors
Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
Sally Goodell, Ada County Highway District
Amy Luft, Community Planning Association
Carl Miller, Community Planning Association
Toni Tisdale, Community Planning Association
Charles Trainor, Community Planning Association
Jeanne Urlezaga, Community Planning Association

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Nancolas called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

Matt Stoll requested to add an additional item under Information/Discussion Items - Debrief of the May 18, 2009, COMPASS/VRT Board Retreat.

David Ferdinand moved and Carol McKee seconded approval of amending the Agenda as requested by Matt Stoll. Motion passed unanimously.

OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Approve April 21, 2009, Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**
- B. Approve April 17, 2009, Special Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

Carol McKee moved and Phil Bandy seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

- A. Establish June 15, 2009, COMPASS Board Agenda**

Matt Stoll presented staff proposed Agenda Items 1-19 for the June 15, 2009, COMPASS Board meeting and requested to add under Special Items, 19-B, Status Report – Stimulus Funds, and 19-C, Status Report – Reauthorization/ Appropriations.

After discussion, **Fred Tilman moved and Phil Bandy seconded approval of Agenda Items 1-19 and Special Items, 19 B and C for the June 15, 2009, Board meeting as presented. Motion passed unanimously.**

- B. Prioritize Projects for Additional Stimulus**

Toni Tisdale reviewed projects for additional stimulus funding.

After discussion, **Fred Tilman moved and Carol McKee seconded recommending approval of the Federal Aid Overlay Arterials and Collectors- FY2010 as the No. 1 STP-TMA priority for additional stimulus funding. Motion passed unanimously.**

After discussion, **Fred Tilman moved and Tammy de Weerd seconded recommending approval of the 21st Avenue and Franklin Road Intersection, Phase IV, Caldwell, as the No. 1 STP-Urban priority for additional stimulus funding. Motion passed unanimously.**

Toni reviewed “step-in” projects for additional stimulus funding. These projects would only be funded if additional funds become available, but would need to be ready for construction (at the expense of the sponsoring jurisdiction). Some projects have small dollar amounts to take advantage of cost savings of lesser amounts of funding – or gap fillers. The plans, specifications, and engineer’s estimate need to be turned in to ITD as soon as possible in order to be ready for funding.

Key Number	Project	Sponsor	Amount
09438	Caldwell Biking-Walking Trail System	Caldwell	\$322,000
09513	Intersection of Cemetery Road and SH 44, Middleton	Middleton	\$684,000
10814	Transit – Capital Lease and Purchase – FY2009	VRT	\$2,300,000
11584	21 st Avenue and Franklin Road Intersection, Phase IV, Caldwell	Caldwell	\$1,230,500
11912C	Transit – Support for Mobility Management Technology and Equipment	VRT	\$555,000
11923	Transit – ADA Bus Stop Improvements (Canyon)	VRT	\$444,000
NEW02	Catalpa Road Sidewalk, Boise	ACHD	\$404,000
NEW04	21 Replacement and 3 Expansion Commuteride Vans, ACHD	ACHD	\$816,000
NEW10	Downtown Boise Bicycle Facilities	CCDC	\$70,000
NEW20	Curtis Road Signal System Upgrade, ACHD	ACHD	\$278,000
NEW21	Ustick Road Signal System Upgrade	ACHD	\$262,000
NEW23	ITS Communication Upgrade, ACHD	ACHD	\$203,000
NEW24	Traffic Signal Timing Potential Project Corridors	ACHD	\$281,000
NEW31	Replace, Retrofit and Interconnect Downtown Traffic Signal, Nampa	Nampa	\$1,174,000

After discussion, *Tom Dale moved and Fred Tilman seconded to move forward with the "Step-in" projects as identified by Toni Tisdale, excluding studies. Motion passed unanimously.*

After discussion, *Fred Tilman moved and Carol McKee seconded adding the prioritized projects to the June 15, 2009, COMPASS Board meeting Agenda for approval. Motion passed unanimously.*

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Discuss Creation of Past Chair Position on the Executive Committee

Chair Nancolas discussed the possible benefits of creating a Past Chair position on the Executive Committee.

Matt Stoll noted the COMPASS Bylaws will need to be amended if the Past Chair position is approved. Matt will draft an amendment to the Bylaws for Executive Committee review at the June 16, 2009, Executive Committee meeting.

B. Status Report – Transportation Management Area Certification Review

Matt Stoll reported that a Transportation Management Area Certification Review will be held at COMPASS on September 16-18, 2009. This process is conducted every 4 years.

C. Review Project Prioritization Process

Toni Tisdale reviewed the Regional Technical Advisory Committee's proposed changes to the project prioritization process.

After discussion, *Matt Stoll stated that he will meet with Kelli Fairless and Sally Goodell to review the current process and proposed changes to determine if there is a need to implement changes as recommended by the Regional Technical Advisory Committee. The group's findings will be brought to the Executive Committee at the June 2009, meeting.*

D. Status Report – Communities in Motion

Matt Stoll discussed staff's concerns regarding the update of *Communities in Motion*. The issue is on the land use assumptions, i.e. the Community Choices land use scenario, and whether it is being followed. If it is not, should the update be based on a hybrid land use scenario?

After discussion, *staff was directed to prepare a high level presentation on what the current direction of the Community Choices scenario looks like today versus what the Trend scenario looks like today for presentation to the Board at the June 2009 Board meeting.*

E. Debrief – May 18, 2009, COMPASS/VRT Retreat

Matt Stoll recapped the May 18, 2009, COMPASS/VRT Retreat. Matt and Kelli Fairless reiterated that they are not advocating for or against the agencies merging. It is a decision for the COMPASS and VRT Boards to make.

ADJOURNMENT

Fred Tilman moved and Phil Bandy seconded adjournment at 3:50 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Dated this 16th day of June 2009.

APPROVED:

*BY: _____
Garret Nancolas, Chair
Community Planning Association*

ATTEST:

*BY: _____
Matthew J. Stoll, Executive Director
Community Planning Association*

T:\FY09\900 Operations\990 Direct Operations-Maintenance\Board\Exec\2009 agendasminutes\minutes05192009.doc

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WORKSHEET FOR COMPASS BOARD AGENDA

ITEM IV-A

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Title/Description</i>	<i>Mandatory¹</i>	<i>Policy Implications/Requirements</i>	<i>Agenda Type²</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Presenter</i>	<i>Proposed Agenda</i>	<i>RTAC Agenda</i>	<i>Program No.</i>
1.	Approve Minutes from most recent Board Meeting	Yes	Meets Idaho Code and various grant requirements.	Consent Agenda	N/A	N/A	Monthly	N/A	820
2.	Receive Minutes from most recent Executive Committee Meeting	Yes	Meets Idaho Code and various grant requirements.	Consent Agenda	N/A	N/A	Monthly	N/A	820
3.	Receive Minutes from most recent Finance Committee Meeting	Yes	Required by the Board's mission statement for the Committee.	Consent Agenda	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	N/A	820
4.	Status Report – Finance Committee Update	No	The Finance Committee Chair will provide an oral status report.	Information/ Discussion	10	Chair	As Appropriate	N/A	820
5.	Status Report – Legislative Issues	No	Legislative consultant team will provide a monthly report on federal and state legislative issues identified as priorities by the Board.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	Ken Burgess	Monthly	N/A	760
6.	Status Report – Corridor Studies	No	Don Matson will provide a monthly report on the status of the Corridor Studies.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	Monthly	N/A	610, 611
7.	Status Report – Current Air Quality Issues	No	Mary Ann Waldinger will provide a monthly report of current air quality issues.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	Monthly	N/A	801
8.	Status Report – Current Transportation Project Information	No	Toni Tisdale will provide a monthly report of current transportation issues and projects.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	Monthly	Monthly	685
9.	Status Report – Standing Committees' Attendance	No	Per Board request of May 17, 2004.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	Monthly	N/A	820
10.	Status Report – Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study	No	Charles Trainor will provide a monthly report on the status of the study.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	Monthly	N/A	631
11.	Status Report - <i>Communities in Motion</i>	Yes	Charles Trainor will provide a monthly report on the status of the update.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	Monthly	N/A	661
12.	Status Report – 2010 Census Preparation	No	Carl Miller will provide a report on the status of the COMPASS preparations for the 2010 Census.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	N/A	620

¹ No, Yes, N/A (Not Applicable)

² Action; Consent Agenda; Executive Director's Report; Information; Special Item; Committee Reports; Open Discussion/Announcements

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Title/Description</i>	<i>Mandatory¹</i>	<i>Policy Implications/Requirements</i>	<i>Agenda Type²</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Presenter</i>	<i>Proposed Agenda</i>	<i>RTAC Agenda</i>	<i>Program No.</i>
13.	Receive Administrative Modifications to the Transportation Improvement Programs	Yes	Toni Tisdale will provide memorandums of approval for Administrative Modifications.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	N/A	685
<i>CURRENT AGENDA ITEMS</i>									
14.	Consider Next Steps Regarding COMPASS/VRT Merger	No	Staff will present meeting notes from joint workshop and seek direction on next steps.	Action	10	Matt Stoll	July	N/A	601
15.	Approve Projects for the End of Year Program	Yes	Staff will present recommendations for projects for ITD to consider for funding through the End of Year program.	Action	10	Toni Tisdale	July	June	685
16.	Approve Project Priorities for TIGER Grants under ARRA Funding	Yes	Staff will present prioritized projects for application for TIGER grants. The Executive Committee will review and recommend projects vetted by the Regional Technical Committee.	Action	10	Toni Tisdale	July	June	685
17.	Approve Amending COMPASS Bylaws to Establish an Immediate Past Chair Position	Yes	The Executive Committee recommends amending the COMPASS Bylaws to establish an Immediate Past Chair position on the Board and Executive Committee.	Action	10	Matt Stoll	July	N/A	991
18.	Review Proposed COMPASS Bylaws Amendment to Establish an Immediate Past Chair Position	Yes	The Executive Committee recommends amending the COMPASS Bylaws to establish an Immediate Past Chair position on the Board and Executive Committee.	Information/ Discussion	10	Matt Stoll	July	N/A	991
19.	Review <i>Communities in Motion</i> Environmental Review Process	No	Staff will present summary of environmental GIS information and mitigation strategies.	Information/ Discussion	10	Liisa Itkonen/ Ross Dodge	July	TBD	661
20.	Review Draft FY2010 UPWP and Budget	No	Staff will review FY2010 UPWP-Draft	Information/ Discussion	10	Matt Stoll	July	May	601
21.	Review Results of <i>Communities in Motion</i> Focus Group Workshops	Yes	Staff will discuss preliminary results from June 2009 workshops.	Information/ Discussion	15	Charles Trainor	July	July	661
22.	Review COMPASS Complete Streets Policy	No	Staff requests review of the COMPASS Complete Streets Policy.	Information/ Discussion	10	Carl Miller	July	May	705

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Title/Description</i>	<i>Mandatory¹</i>	<i>Policy Implications/Requirements</i>	<i>Agenda Type²</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Presenter</i>	<i>Proposed Agenda</i>	<i>RTAC Agenda</i>	<i>Program No.</i>
23.	Review the FY2010-2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Project List for Public Involvement	Yes	Staff requests review of the draft project list for the FY2010-2014 TIP for public involvement.	Information/ Discussion	10	Toni Tisdale	July	July	685
24.	Review Prioritization Process for Regional Transportation Improvement Program	No	The Regional Technical Advisory Committee recommends major revisions to the prioritization process.	Information/ Discussion	10	Toni Tisdale	July	June	685
<i>UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS</i>									
25.	Approve the Draft FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program Project List for Public Involvement	Yes	Staff requests approval to release the Draft FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program for public review and input.	Action	10	Toni Tisdale	August	August	685
26.	Adopt Resolution Approving the FY2010 UPWP and Budget- Final	Yes	Staff requests adoption of Resolution xx-2009 approving FY2010 UPWP - Final	Action	15	Matt Stoll	August	May	601
27.	Approve Prioritization Process for Regional Transportation Improvement Program	No	The Regional Technical Advisory Committee recommends major revisions to the prioritization process.	Action	15	Toni Tisdale	August	July	685
28.	Adopt COMPASS Complete Streets Policy	No	Staff requests adoption of the COMPASS Complete Streets Policy.	Action	15	Carl Miller	August	May	705
29.	Review COMPASS Development Review Protocol	No	Staff requests adoption of the COMPASS Development Review protocol to standardize how development applications will be reviewed by COMPASS staff.	Information/ Discussion	15	Carl Miller	August	May	705
30.	Review Western Canyon County Economic Development Scenarios	No	Staff will review the study, including scenarios and possible impacts to infrastructure.	Information/ Discussion	10	Don Matson & SAGE	August	July	767
31.	Update on Mobility Management Strategies	No	Staff will present update of mobility management projects.	Information/ Discussion	15	Liisa Itkonen	August	August	671
32.	Adopt COMPASS Development Review Protocol	No	Staff requests review of the COMPASS Development Review protocol which will standardize how development applications will be reviewed by COMPASS staff.	Action	15	Carl Miller	September	May	705

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Title/Description</i>	<i>Mandatory¹</i>	<i>Policy Implications/Requirements</i>	<i>Agenda Type²</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Presenter</i>	<i>Proposed Agenda</i>	<i>RTAC Agenda</i>	<i>Program No.</i>
33.	Review Priority Corridor recommendations from the Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study	No	Staff/consultant will present alignment and modal options within the Priority Corridor between Ada and Canyon Counties	Action	20	Charles Trainor	September	August	631
34.	Adopt Resolution XX-2009 Approving the FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program and Air Quality Conformity	Yes	Staff requests adoption of Resolution XX-2009 approving the FY2010-2014 TIP and air quality conformity.	Action	10	Toni Tisdale	September	August	685
35.	Review Information for Public Meeting on Communities in Motion Update	Yes	Staff will present draft information for the October public open house on CIM update	Information/Discussion	30	Charles Trainor	September	August	661
36.	Participate in Transit Corridor Development workshop	No	Representatives with success and experience in the Bellevue-Redmond (WA) corridor project will facilitate a workshop on transit corridors	Information/Discussion	50-60	Kelli Fairless/Don Matson	September	n/a	701.28
37.	TALK TO MATT BEFORE ADDING ITEMS IN FOR OCTOBER						October		
38.	Approve Mirroring Changes to the FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program	Yes	Staff requests approval of the mirroring changes to the FY2010-2014 TIP.	Action or Consent	10	Toni Tisdale	November	October	685
39.	Adopt updated Public Involvement Policy	Yes	Staff will present and seek adoption of updated Public Involvement Policy	Action	10	Amy Luft	November	August (PPC)	653
40.	Consider Recommended Transportation System for Communities in Motion	No	Staff will present the proposed transportation system for CIM	Information/Discussion	30	Charles Trainor	November	October	661
41.	Review Findings and Recommendations of US 20/26 Corridor Preservation Study	No	Staff will present recommendations from study (Environmental Assessment, etc.).	Information/Discussion	15	Don Matson	November	CPC October	611
42.	Review Recommendations of SH 44 Access Management Plan	No	Staff will present draft Access Management Plan, a part of the ongoing Corridor Preservation Study for SH 44	Information/Discussion	15	Don Matson	November	CPC October	611
43.	Approve recommendations of SH 44 Access Management Plan	No	Staff will seek approval of Access Management Plan for SH 44.	Consent Agenda	N/A	Don Matson	December	N/A	611
44.	Approve Recommended Transportation System for Inclusion into Communities in Motion	No	Staff will present and seek approval of the proposed transportation system for CIM	Action	30	Charles Trainor	December	November	661

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Title/Description</i>	<i>Mandatory¹</i>	<i>Policy Implications/Requirements</i>	<i>Agenda Type²</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Presenter</i>	<i>Proposed Agenda</i>	<i>RTAC Agenda</i>	<i>Program No.</i>
45.	Accept Recommendations of US 20/26 Corridor Preservation Study	No	Staff will seek acceptance of documents (Environmental Assessment, etc.) prepared for FHWA.	Consent Agenda	N/A	Don Matson	December	N/A	611
46.	Accept Land Use Allocation Report	No	Staff will seek Board acceptance of the report.	Action	20	Carl Miller	December	November	647
47.	Present Leadership in Motion Awards	No	Recognize member agencies, businesses, and individuals for leadership in supporting Communities in Motion goals.	Information/ Discussion	15	TBD (Coordinated by Amy Luft)	December	N/A	653
48.	Review Findings and Recommendations of SH 44 Corridor Preservation Study Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and other documents	No	Staff will present findings and recommendations from study.	Information/ Discussion	15	Don Matson	January 2010	CPC December 2009	610
49.	Receive update on Findings and Recommendations of SH 44 Corridor Preservation Study Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and other documents	No	Staff will present an update of findings and recommendations in EIS, other documents.	Information/ Discussion	5	Don Matson	April 2010	CPC Mar 2010	610
50.	Accept Recommendations of SH 44 Corridor Preservation Study	No	Staff will present and seek acceptance of EIS and other study documents prepared for FHWA.	Consent Agenda	N/A	Don Matson	May 2010	N/A	610
51.	Workshop – Air Quality Conformity Process	No	COMPASS and DEQ staff will facilitate a discussion regarding air quality conformity and the transportation system.	Workshop	60	TBD	TBD	N/A	N/A
52.	Workshop- High Capacity Transit Projects and Land Use	No	Consultant facilitated Board Workshop on high capacity transit projects and related land use issues.	Workshop	60	TBD	TBD	N/A	N/A
53.	Status Report – Transportation Project Coordination	No	Staff will report on progress in coordinating transportation projects and construction related delays	Information/ Discussion	15	Charles Trainor	TBD	TBD	701

T:\FY08\900 Operations\990 Direct Operations-Maintenance\Board\COMPASS Board Agenda Worksheet.doc



MEMORANDUM

To: Executive Committee

FROM: Carl Miller, Principal Planner

DATE: June 16, 2009

RE: **Recommend Approval of Development Review Protocol**

ACTION REQUESTED:

Recommend approval of Development Review Protocol.

BACKGROUND:

Communities in Motion, adopted in August 2006, states the objective of Objective 2.1, is to, "Provide guidance to local governments regarding how land use plans and policies can implement the vision of **Communities in Motion** as depicted by the Community Choices growth scenario. " The purpose of the Development Review protocol is to standardize when and how COMPASS staff conduct development reviews as a service to member agencies.

COMPASS' role in development review is limited to providing member agencies with technical evaluations of proposed projects or plans. COMPASS staff is not tasked with judging the merits of a proposed development--e.g., recommending if a project should or should not be approved. Rather, COMPASS staff focuses on whether the proposal is consistent with the growth envisioned in the current long-range transportation plan and provides a technical review of information relating to the transportation network.

STATUS:

At the April 2009 RTAC meetings, RTAC recommended approval of the Development Review Protocol (attached). However, the protocol was recommended with a split vote (12-4).

Several RTAC members expressed concern with Item #3 of the Development Review Protocol which states, "A development review request can be made for any location whether inside or outside of the requesting agency's jurisdiction...." Members requested that only the lead land use agencies make the request, multiple Board members are required to make requests outside of their purview, and desired a workgroup to develop an alternative policy.

Attachment (1) - COMPASS Development Review Protocol

CM: T:\FY09\700 Services\705 Transportation Liaison\Development Review\execmmo_develop review_051909.docx

COMPASS Development Review Protocol

(Adopted _____, 2009)

1. The purpose of the Development Review protocol is to standardize when and how COMPASS staff conduct development reviews as a service to member agencies.
2. Upon notification, COMPASS will review developments that will generate more than 2,500 average daily trips (ADT). Approximately 250 single-family residential units or 25,000 square feet of commercial space would meet that threshold.
3. Developments less than 2,500 ADT will be reviewed upon digitally submitted written request of a COMPASS Board member. This request can be made for any location whether inside or outside of the requesting agency's jurisdiction. A note in the review letter will indicate the requesting agency.
4. Development review requests shall be accompanied by a transmittal letter via hard copy or email that includes the name, size, type, and location of the development, relevant information to assist in the review such as a site plan, the requested response date, and the scheduled date of public hearing.
5. COMPASS staff will coordinate with Valley Regional Transit staff and provide comment and recommend conditions on the following items as appropriate:
 - a. Size, location, and type of development, background traffic, and functional classification of affected roadways, and capacity within the Communities in Motion growth scenarios (i.e. "Community Choices" and "Trend").
 - b. Access management and access location.
 - c. Location and proximity of the development to corridors listed in the current long-range transportation plan for improvement – funded, illustrative, or preservation.
 - d. Existing and planned transportation alternatives in general area of proposed development. Examples of alternatives would include fixed-route bus services, express bus services, and bike facilities.
 - e. Other issues pertaining to regional transportation and transit planning that fulfill requirements of the jurisdictions ordinances and comprehensive plans (if any).
6. COMPASS will copy development review letters to affected agencies such as highway districts, cities, counties, and Idaho Transportation Department as appropriate.
7. COMPASS staff will also review the development in consideration of the Mobility Management Development checklist¹ upon completion (anticipated completion September 2009).
8. COMPASS staff will have ten (10) business days from date of receipt to complete the development review and transmit correspondence. This deadline may be adjusted per agreement of the requesting member agency and COMPASS staff. Development review letters will be transmitted both electronically and/or via a letter. If a public hearing is scheduled to take place before the development review timeframe closes, COMPASS may notify the requesting agency of the conflict.
9. COMPASS staff will provide verbal testimony at public hearings upon request of the hearing body and contingent upon ten (10) business days notice.

¹ The Mobility Management Development checklist is a product currently being developed to better integrate mobility and access into local land use and development decisions, and help enhance mobility and access to transportation services for targeted / disadvantaged groups in rural, suburban and urban areas. This product is being funded by Federal Transit Administration programs 5316—Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and 5317—New Freedom Program.

From: Stephen Freiburger [mailto:sfreiburger@paragonfbk.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 11:22 AM
To: Charles Trainor; Matt Stoll
Cc: Jim Buffington; bowmancm@cityofnampa.us; Joe Barton; borton@ci.caldwell.id.us; jvoorhees@canyonhd4.org
Subject: Development Review Protocol - Dissent Opinion

Charles,

As requested, we offer the following opposition comments for consideration by the COMPASS when they analyze the proposed protocol for adoption.

1. This proposal contravenes a “working agreement” that member agencies have had with COMPASS staff for the last year, namely that all policy and other issues will go through a sub-committee for formulation rather than being brought directly to RTAC without sub-committee consideration.
 - a. Too often in the past COMPASS staff drafted policies and brought them directly to RTAC for discussion and/or action. The intent of the working agreement is to create a sub-committee of interested RTAC members, discuss the issues in a small group setting, reach consensus and draft an action item to be brought to RTAC. Unfortunately, this protocol has been on the full RTAC agenda multiple times in recent months with no opportunity for sub-committee members to assist in drafting language or reaching consensus on its substance.
2. There is nothing in this proposal that resolves the initial problem for which it was the intended solution – indeed, it may perpetuate and exacerbate the problem.
 - a. This issue apparently came to RTAC as a COMPASS staff effort to help resolve a situation where staff were, and could repeatedly be, placed in the middle between two member agencies. It seems Boise City requested COMPASS staff to weigh in on a difference of opinion between Boise City and another agency, thereby putting COMPASS staff in an untenable position between them. Indeed, this proposal, as written, will likely exacerbate the situation since the proposal states that any agency’s board member can request a review at any time and that:

“...this request can be made for any location whether inside or outside of the requesting agency’s jurisdiction.”

This statement extends an open-ended invitation for COMPASS staff to be placed in untenable situations with respect to member agencies that differ in their opinions about proposed developments or transportation improvements.
3. This appears to be an Ada County issue and perhaps could be re-framed as an Ada County only protocol.
 - a. The vote on whether or not to forward this protocol to the COMPASS Board for adoption was a split vote, with all but one Canyon County representative voting against it. Canyon County agencies already have in place working agreements that allow differences of opinion about development proposals or transportation projects to be worked out off-line, without placing COMPASS staff in the role of choosing sides.

4. Significant overlap exists between this protocol and the TIS protocol already adopted by the COMPASS Board and needs to be addressed by RTAC and COMPASS staff before this protocol is adopted by the COMPASS Board.
5. Multiple questions were raised in RTAC discussions of this protocol regarding how it is different than the TIS protocol and how the two are inter-related. Staff responses were generally of the “Oh, that won’t be a problem” variety. We firmly disagree. Our request is that this protocol be remanded to RTAC with specific direction from the Board to utilize the sub-committee process to re-consider both of these protocols and either merge them into a single protocol or clarify them so as to remove the ambiguous overlap between them.

Thanks for your consideration on our concerns and if you have any questions or need any additional information regarding our dissent, please contact me or Clair Bowman at your earliest convenience.

F.
Stephen F. Freiburger, PE
NHD Engineer

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA ITEM IV-C

DATE: JUNE 16, 2009



Topic: Establishing Immediate Past Chair Position on Executive Committee

Summary:

At the May 19, 2009 Executive Committee meeting, staff was directed to review and identify necessary modifications to the Joint Powers Agreement and Bylaws to create an Immediate Past Chair position on the Executive Committee. Staff has determined that the Joint Powers Agreement does not have to be amended to establish the position. However, the Bylaws should be amended as shown in Attachment I to establish the position.

Board approval at a supermajority level is required to amend the organization's bylaws. The Board can take action on the Bylaws at the August 2009 meeting if notification of the proposed amendment is provided at the July 2009 meeting.

Staff Recommendation/Request:

Recommend establishment of the Immediate Past Chair position on Executive Committee.

Implication (policy and/or financial):

Establishment of the position provides for continuity of leadership and consul on the Executive Committee. There is no fiscal impact.

Highlights:

- Establishes Immediate Past Chair position on Executive Committee.
- Requires one month prior notice to Board of intent to amend Bylaws.

More Information:

- 1) Attachment 1 – Proposed Bylaws Amendment
- 2) For detailed information contact Matt Stoll at 855-2558 extension 241 or mstoll@compassidaho.org.

T:\FY09\900 Operations\990 Direct Operations-Maintenance\Board\Matt's Memos\090616 Past Chair Position Memo.doc

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

Article VI. Standing Committees

Section 2. Executive Committee:

A. Establishment. An Executive Committee is hereby established as a standing committee of the Board.

B. Membership. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the following Voting Directors:

1. All four Board Officers;
2. The mayor of each General Member that is an incorporated city with a current population greater than 25,000 according to the most recent population estimates adopted by the Board;
3. The chair of each county commission;
4. The president of each single county-wide highway district commission;
5. Two (2) mayors of General Members who are incorporated cities with a current population of 25,000 or fewer according to the most recent population estimates adopted by the Board and who shall annually be selected by the representatives of the cities who fit into that classification, provided, however, that the total number of mayors on the Executive Committee from this grouping of smaller cities shall not exceed two (2);

6. The immediate past Chairman.

67. Notwithstanding Sections 2.B.2 through 2.B.46, there shall be no more than one Voting Director on the Executive Committee from any member agency.

Table 1:

Scribe: Jeanne Urlezaga

Board Members:

Kathy Alder
Maryann Jordan
John Evans
Doug Foye
Sherry Huber
Phil Kushlan
Bryce Millar
Brent Orton
Charlie Rountree - Table Leader
Fred Tilman
Pete Wagner

QUESTION 1:

IS THERE ANYTHING MISSING FROM THE RESPONSES TO THE ON-LINE SURVEY? IF SO, WHAT DO YOU THINK IS MISSING?

- *Previous discussion on merger/other entities*
- *What are we trying to accomplish*
- *More detailed information*
- *How do you define success in merging operating/planning*
- *Ada vs. Canyon structure/voting*
- *Ada County Highway/Cities joint meetings without merger*

QUESTION 2:

FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION/COMMUNITY, WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OR DISADVANTAGES IN MERGING THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS?

ADVANTAGES:*

- *Communication both at same meeting – TIP processes (10)*
- *Cost savings/duplication of staff functions (7)*
- *Less meetings (6)*
- *Air quality – less trips (3)*
- *Joint meetings without merging*

DISADVANTAGES:*

- *Merger/solve current issues in survey (11)*
- *Reduced representation (8)*
- *Legal issues – statutory to volunteer agency (3)*

- *Cost savings – minor (3)*
- *Negotiator with Union – Who? (2)*
- *Impacts on employees and org. structure (1)*

QUESTION 3:

WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?*

- *Identify what are problems trying to resolve (26)*
- *Get external opinion/Assess Merger (4)*

*Items are listed in order of importance, based on the number of stickers placed next to each. Numbers in red following each item are the number of stickers each item received.

Table 2:

Scribe: Amy Luft

Board Members:

Rebecca Arnold
John Bechtel
Dave Bieter
Tom Dale
Rob Hopper
Carol McKee - Table Leader
Nate Mitchell
Steve Rule
Sharon Ullman
Dave Zarembo

QUESTION 1:

IS THERE ANYTHING MISSING FROM THE RESPONSES TO THE ON-LINE SURVEY? IF SO, WHAT DO YOU THINK IS MISSING?

TABLE 2 did not respond to Question 1.

QUESTION 2:

FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION/COMMUNITY, WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OR DISADVANTAGES IN MERGING THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS?

ADVANTAGES:*

- *Consider co-locating without merging (grasp potential savings) (10)*
- *Integrate transit with rest of transportation (5)*
- *Gain credibility when pursuing dollars (3)*
- *More efficiency (3)*
- *Levels the playing field (more equal power) (2)*
- *Potential significant dollar savings (2)*
- *Stronger/speak with one voice (1)*
- *Less VMT/Improved Air Quality (1)*
- *Already the same people*
- *Get what pay for/pay for what get*

DISADVANTAGES:*

- *Not ready (6)*
- *Not enough savings as proposed (6)*
- *Will transit get lost/lose focus? (3)*
- *Un-balanced (votes don't equal dollars/population) (2)*

- *Lose autonomy (have different functions) (2)*
- *Dilute VRT current success (2)*
- *Only successful if strongly supported*
- *Process of merging burdensome*
- *Original issue was board attendance – no longer issue*

QUESTION 3:

WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?*

- *Look at co-locating without merger: (14)*
 - *Look for building*
 - *Legal Council – share*
 - *Grant Writing*
- *Bring to full Board in June (7)*
- *Identify additional advantages not yet discussed (2)*

*Items are listed in order of importance, based on the number of stickers placed next to each. Numbers in red following each item are the number of stickers each item received.

Table 3:

Scribe: Charles Trainor

Board Members:

Sara Baker
Keith Bird
Elaine Clegg
Tammy de Weerd
David Ferdinand
Dave Jones
Garret Nancolas – Table Leader
Jerome Scroggins
Martin Thorne
Mike Vuittonet
Rick Yzaguirre

QUESTION 1:

IS THERE ANYTHING MISSING FROM THE RESPONSES TO THE ON-LINE SURVEY? IF SO, WHAT DO YOU THINK IS MISSING?

- *AQ Modeling*
- *Doesn't know where we want to be*
- *Efficiency and economy of scale*
- *What benefit for region from structure*
- *What would be lost? Gained?*
- *Momentum of VRT*
- *Talking heads – no follow through*
- *Planning vs. implementation*
- *VRT and COMPASS- neither comprehensive*
- *No effect on roadway operating decisions*
- *Better decision making process in VRT*

QUESTION 2:

FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION/COMMUNITY, WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OR DISADVANTAGES IN MERGING THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS?

ADVANTAGES:*

- *Could cut expenses – measureable savings (8)*
- *Clearer delineation/perception of purpose for region transportation (7)*
- *If organization has “teeth” land use/transportation decisions accountable way. SANDAG model (4)*
- *Make more efficient – smaller government (3)*
- *Efficiency (2)*
- *Regional structure (1)*

- *Stronger voice with legislature (1)*
- *Change now for future (1)*
- *Reauthorization*
- *Comprehensive planning including: pathways/transit/roads tie to local option tax*

DISADVANTAGES:*

- *Change in organization alone not sufficient. Need more basic change – more power! (8)*
- *Fewer voices – less perspectives (7)*
- *Take energy away from VRT timing problem (6)*
- *Make up of Board (dues, etc.) (3)*
- *Loss of institutional knowledge – staff has more power (3)*
- *Perceived loss of power (Boise) – may break away (1)*
- *Two orgs – neither sustainable*
- *Pots of funding – tracking FTA/FHWA funds*
- *Reauthorization*
- *How to pick representative (e.g. HDs)*
- *VRT may be consumed by COMPASS – loss of identity*
- *Need other changes to be effective*

QUESTION 3:

WHAT ARE THE NEXT STEPS?*

- *More information needed – Financial savings (10)*
- *Develop objectives (8)*
- *Board vote – go forward? (5)*
- *Refine structure (2)*
- *What do we define as success (1)*
- *More in depth and broader look – consultant? (1)*

*Items are listed in order of importance, based on the number of stickers placed next to each. Numbers in red following each item are the number of stickers each item received.