

*REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 25, 2009
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION*

****MINUTES****

- ATTENDEES:*
- Sabrina Anderson, Ada County Highway District
 - Mary Barker, Valley Regional Transit
 - Troy Behunin, City of Kuna (*for Steve Hasson*)
 - Clair Bowman, City of Nampa
 - Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation
 - Phil Choate, Idaho Transportation Department-District 3
 - Stephen Freiburger, Nampa Highway District #1 (*for Jim Buffington*)
 - Caleb Hood, City of Meridian
 - Wendy Howell, City of Middleton
 - Jeff Lowe, City of Eagle
 - David Luft, Department of Environmental Quality
 - Ryan McDaniel, City of Boise
 - Brent Orton, City of Caldwell, *Chair*
 - Deanna Smith, Public Participation Committee
 - Toni Tisdale, COMPASS (*Ex-Officio*)
 - Jim Voorhees, Canyon Highway District #4
 - Jarom Wagoner, Canyon County Development Services
 - Kelly Woodworth, Ada County Development Services (*for Jim Farrens*)
- MEMBERS ABSENT:*
- LeAnn Carlsen, Joint School District #2
 - Jared Everett, Boise State University
 - Anne Horn, Mayor, City of Notus
 - Rob Howarth, Central District Health Department (*Ex-Officio*)
 - Sarah Stobaugh, Boise Independent School District
 - Mary Shaw Taylor, City of Star
 - Jenah Thornborrow, City of Garden City
 - Margie Watson, Mayor, City of Parma
- OTHERS PRESENT:*
- John Cullerton, URS-Portland (via conference call)
 - Liisa Itkonen, COMPASS
 - Eric Lindstrom, Kittelson & Associates
 - Amy Luft, COMPASS
 - Don Matson, COMPASS
 - Gonzalo Melosevich, Kittelson & Associates
 - Carl Miller, COMPASS
 - Sai Kumar Sarepalli, Holladay Engineering Company
 - Charles Trainor, COMPASS
 - MaryAnn Waldinger, COMPASS
 - Debbie Winchar, COMPASS



800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

CALL TO ORDER

Toni Tisdale called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Introductions were made of all attendees.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

Jeff Lowe moved and Wendy Howell seconded to add a discussion item regarding the election of a Vice Chair. The motion passed unanimously.

OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Toni Tisdale distributed a handout: Summary of America Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Toni commented that the contents of this current summary is still up for interpretation and may change. If changes are made, they will be forwarded to RTAC.

Jon Cecil requested that the 10th Street Multimodal Center – Traffic Simulation Video be posted to the COMPASS website.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve January 28, 2009 Meeting Minutes

B. Recommend Approval of the Functional Classification System Update

Jon Cecil stated that there is a minor correction to the January 28, 2009 meeting minutes.

Clair Bowman moved and Jarom Wagoner seconded to approve the Consent Agenda minus item: A. Approve January 28, 2009 Meeting Minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Jon Cecil moved and Phil Choate seconded to move approval of the January 28, 2009 meeting minutes under the Action Items. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Approve January 28, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Jon Cecil stated that under Action Item, A. Election of Chair and Vice Chair, the motion should be amended to read: "By unanimous consent, Nichoel Baird Spencer was elected to serve as RTAC's *Vice* Chair for 2009."

Jeff Lowe commented that Nichoel Baird Spencer will no longer be attending RTAC meetings and he will now represent the City of Eagle on RTAC. Jeff suggested a discussion item be added regarding the election of a new Vice Chair.

Jon Cecil moved and Phil Choate seconded to approve the January 28, 2009 meeting minutes as amended. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

Jeff Lowe moved and Wendy Howell seconded to add a discussion item to the end of the agenda regarding the election of a new Vice Chair. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

A. *Update on the Priority Corridor Evaluation, High Capacity Study*

Charles Trainor introduced John Cullerton, URS-Portland, (via conference call), the consultant who prepared the 70-page report of background information laying out the purpose of this study's different modal and corridor options.

John Cullerton stated that the focus is on the Boise cutoff as mid-point and potential alignments that would serve the overall travel corridor: going as far north as Chinden Boulevard and as far south as Victory Road. John reviewed the handout: Table 5:1, Initial Alignment Assessment Summary.

Charles commented that one of the reasons for doing this corridor evaluation is to prepare for the next evaluation. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will not allow a technical analysis of the rail corridor alone. The rail corridor has to be reviewed in the context that all reasonable alternatives to resolve the problem have been addressed.

John stated that the FTA's alternatives analysis process identifies the nature of the travel market, the problems the region is trying to address, and a set of reasonable transit alternatives that could address those problems (mode and alignment alternatives). The alternatives analysis process is intended to cast a wide net and look at anything that might be potentially feasible, and then narrow that down and focus in on a small set of the most promising alignment and mode alternatives.

Charles commented that this is not intended to be a regional transit plan, but an evaluation of resolving a specific issue or problem corridor. It is setting up for a subsequent alternatives analysis for which we are seeking \$2 million on earmark funds.

After discussion, Charles stated that this project needs to wrap up by September 30, 2009, at the latest. Charles asked John to prepare a calendar of key events that will come back to RTAC. Charles requested specific comments be forwarded to him so he can forward them to John.

After further discussion, Phil Choate moved and Jon Cecil seconded to defer further discussion of this item to RTAC's March 2009 meeting. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

Jon Cecil requested that the 5MB document discussed today be emailed to those who were not able to access it.

Chair Orton suggested that because of a time constraint for MaryAnn Waldinger, Item IV-C be presented before Item IV-B. Phil Choate, the next presenter, concurred.

C. *Overview of Air Quality Conformity Demonstration*

MaryAnn Waldinger presented an overview of the air quality conformity demonstration process.

Clair Bowman stated the Department of Environmental Quality is moving toward requiring air quality inspections in Canyon County. According to the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA) rules, if that happens, Canyon County would be subject to the air quality conformity demonstrations as well. In the not too distant future, all Canyon County projects will be subject to the same criteria.

Sabrina Anderson commented that if the Ada County Highway Department's (ACHD) commission delays adoption of the Five-Year Work Plan, air quality conformity will move forward with the best information available in April and if more information is obtained thereafter, an amendment process would take place. Sabrina asked what COMPASS needs for air quality conformity from the Five-Year Work Plan.

MaryAnn replied if there is a need to demonstrate conformity for the FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and in order to go to the public in June 2009, information is needed by April 2009 from the highway districts. When the programs are final, a calendar will be created in order to move forward with an amendment.

Toni Tisdale clarified if the COMPASS Board wants to keep the current schedule on the FY2010-2014 TIP update, the amendment would not occur until after the final adoption.

MaryAnn stated she will do some research and have a discussion with the Federal Highway Administration to obtain the required project information for Canyon County representatives.

B. Discussion on Frequency of Updating Population Signs

Phil Choate presented and reviewed a handout entitled: Section 186.00 – Government Boundary Signs, explaining how the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) alters population information on city signs. Phil said that ITD does not use an internal source of information on population estimates. That is done by a staff person at the State Department of Commerce who provides the information to ITD. If there is a significant change to a population figure, ITD will alter the signs once a year. Phil stated that Kevin Sablan is ITD's primary contact for those requests.

Ryan McDaniel commented that Chuck Spencer from ACHD is embarking on a project to map and categorize streets signs within the district.

D. Overview of Mobility Management Strategies

Liisa Itkonen gave a PowerPoint presentation on the purpose and Scope of Work of Mobility Management Strategies. Liisa stated that these are strategies that result in more efficient and innovative uses of transportation resources with an emphasis on moving people not just motor vehicles. The projects are designed to obtain information that would allow the most efficient use of the current transportation services and then develop other projects to either better coordinate those services or develop additional resources.

Liisa commented the work is funded by Valley Regional Transit's (VRT) 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute and 5317 New Freedom grants. COMPASS is working closely with VRT on their "sister" projects by providing research and information that allows VRT to develop projects for implementation. Liisa reviewed six specific demonstration projects on which COMPASS is working. COMPASS staff will complete the demonstration projects by September 2009 but the funding will continue for the next fiscal year.

Jon Cecil suggested that some consideration be given, if possible, to the broader population and not just the elderly, disabled, and low income.

Liisa replied that we have to make sure that everything that is done in these projects will touch those target populations because the grant funding is tied to these specific populations. It has been a good start to focus on these populations; the information coming out of this process will then be broadened to other populations.

Mary Barker stated that VRT has a planner on staff who is working primarily on mobility management. Mary said that she is working more on the traditional transit role. Mary, as part of the mobility management team, is taking what is being done and applying it to the broader population. VRT is also doing parallel projects (i.e., looking at a survey of how the services are working for the target populations and doing a similar survey of how the general population is being served on a number of the projects mentioned).

*E. Review Schedule of **Communities in Motion (CIM) Update***

Charles Trainor provided a PowerPoint review of the key issues and general schedule to the CIM Update.

Discussion:

Stephen Freiburger stated there has been discussion regarding projects; there are corridors in CIM, not projects. This is a detail that needs to be worked out during the plan update. Also in previous discussions an issue was raised about addressing "Community Choices" versus "Trend" which needs to be a part of this discussion and, in previous discussions an agreement was made that a subcommittee would work with COMPASS to guide this process. A start date needs to be scheduled.

The following members volunteered to be on the subcommittee:

Stephen Freiburger, Nampa Highway District #1
Sabrina Anderson, ACHD
Phil Choate, ITD
Ryan McDaniel, City of Boise
Jarom Wagoner, Canyon County Development Services
Mary Barker, VRT
Jeff Lowe, City of Eagle
Wendy Howell, City of Middleton (or alternate rep.)
Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation (tentative)

Charles stated the purpose of the growth and allocation process is to have a Trend Scenario, Community Choices Scenario, and Comprehensive Plan and Preservation Scenario. RTAC and the COMPASS Board will be asked for their preference.

After further discussion, Deanna Smith commented that the goal of having people adopt CIM is significant and one of the goals for the update should be to create a document that everyone will adopt.

F. Discussion regarding COMPASS' Role in Development Reviews

Carl Miller presented a review of the criteria for coordinating Development Reviews.

Discussion:

Clair Bowman commented that since RTAC's last meeting, the City of Nampa had discussions regarding this item and one of the responses was, when we are interested in it, it is a great resource but it would be better to have it initiated by the City so that a turnaround time can be negotiated. A uniform schedule cannot be applied to all development projects. Nampa looks forward to the assistance, but would like to have it at the City's initiation.

Mary Barker stated that VRT is in the process of trying to formalize their development review process. VRT will do it through COMPASS or independently, whatever works best for the jurisdictions.

Sabrina Anderson commented that COMPASS gives a regional perspective to ACHD's development staff, at least for the larger projects, which is very helpful. COMPASS staff and cities' staff may have a different perspective of what the potential impact may be. A clear protocol is needed.

Caleb Hood stated the City of Meridian would definitely be interested in this process. The City does not have a staff person who would be qualified to answer questions, particularly when looking at the regionally significant corridors.

Carl clarified that the TIS recommended practices have been adopted by RTAC, which will not be changed. However, is there value in staff providing just the development review letter that is sent to the respective commissions or councils regarding other applications that do not trigger a TIS and if so, are we using the same criteria and topics?

Charles Trainor replied that some of the challenge in the last several months has been that people have assumed COMPASS has internally been commenting on all these projects, when in fact, staff has been commenting on projects when requested to do so. Staff is seeking clarity.

After further discussion, Chair Orton stated that RTAC's best value as a committee comes about in realizing this is a tool and the committee has an opportunity to collaborate but never want to make each other feel like something is trying to be imposed on the respective agencies.

Caleb suggested that valid requests be made by management level staff from each agency and not administrative assistants asking for COMPASS time to review development projects. A threshold should be determined by each individual agency.

After discussion, *Stephen Freiburger moved and Caleb Hood seconded to have Carl Miller formulate a summary of the direction given; that each respective land use agency will develop a process when requesting development reviews, and bring it back to RTAC for approval at the March 2009 meeting.*

Discussion:

Clair Bowman requested utilizing email over the next month as a way to obtain committee input and not have to start the discussion all over again at the March 2009 meeting.

After further discussion, *the motion was unanimously approved.*

G. Discussion regarding Construction and Studies Coordination

Chair Orton suggested that in the interest of time, this item will be tabled until the next scheduled meeting.

H. Discussion regarding the Election of a Vice Chair

This item will be tabled until the next scheduled meeting.

OTHER

A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 25, 2009, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m.