



**REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APRIL 25, 2012  
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**

**\*\* AMENDED MINUTES \*\***

**ATTENDEES:**

Sabrina Anderson, Ada County Highway District  
 Mary Barker, Valley Regional Transit  
 Clair Bowman, City of Nampa, **Vice Chair**  
 Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation  
 Michael Garz, Idaho Transportation Department,  
 District 3  
 Ryan Head, Ada County Highway District  
 Caleb Hood, City of Meridian, **Chair**  
 Chris Hopper, Canyon Highway District No. 4  
 Wendy Howell, City of Kuna  
 Patricia Nilsson, City of Boise  
 Eric Shannon, Nampa Highway District No. 1  
 Nichoel Baird Spencer, City of Eagle  
 Michael Toole, Department of Environmental  
 Quality

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Jennifer Almeida, Canyon County Development  
 Services  
 Jeff Barnes, City of Nampa  
 Rob Howarth, Central District Health Department  
*(Ex-Officio)*  
 Casey Jones, Boise State University  
 Megan Leatherman, Ada County Development  
 Services  
 Robb MacDonald, City of Caldwell  
 Nathan Mitchell, Mayor, City of Star  
 Deanna Smith, Public Participation Committee  
 Darin Taylor, City of Middleton  
 Craig Telford, Mayor, City of Parma  
 Jenah Thornborrow, City of Garden City

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Keith Holmes, COMPASS  
 Don Matson, COMPASS  
 Carl Miller, COMPASS  
 Scott Moreno, COMPASS  
 Matt Stoll, COMPASS  
 Toni Tisdale, COMPASS  
 Charles Trainor, COMPASS  
 Jeanne Urlezaga, COMPASS  
 Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

700 N. East 2nd Street,

Suite 200

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

[www.compassidaho.org](http://www.compassidaho.org)

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Hood called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

## **AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES**

None.

## **OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Hood welcomed Wendy Howell as the City of Kuna's representative on RTAC.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **A. Approve March 28, 2012 Meeting Minutes**

**Nichoel Baird Spencer moved and Ryan Head seconded to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion passed unanimously.**

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **A. Recommend Prioritized Needs for the End-of-Year Program**

Toni Tisdale provided a prioritized list of funding needs for the End-of-Year Program. Toni said there is one change: #3, Intersection of Star Road and Franklin Road – \$124,000 came in for this project through Urban Balancing which would change the amount needed to CN/**\$236,000**.

After discussion, **Ryan Head moved and Nichoel Baird Spencer seconded to recommend the Prioritized Needs for the End-of-Year Program with the one change to #3, Intersection of Star Road and Franklin Road. Motion passed unanimously.**

### **B. Review Screening Results and Recommend Approval of Proposed Project List for FY2013 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget (UPWP)**

Don Matson reviewed the screening results and requested approval of proposed projects for FY2013 UPWP. Following a discussion of each proposal, Committee members were polled via the Audience Response System (ARS) devices whether they thought it should be a high, moderate, or low priority. The discussion and ARS polling was to collect opinions from all Committee members in the room; it was not intended to be, nor formatted as, voting on programs.

### **Discussion:**

- Regional High Speed Corridor Study (501):
  - We need to do *Communities in Motion* (CIM) before addressing high speed corridors that we can't afford. What will the deliverable be and how will it be integrated with the work and discussion underway with the update to CIM?
  - Regarding the timing of this request; put it out a year or two and then readdress it as CIM is drawing to a conclusion.

**ARS Results:** High=1, Moderate=3, Low=9

- What is the scope in terms of the terminology “high speed corridor?” A lot of work has been done on the Kuna-Mora study. Get through CIM and then figure out what the scope looks like and scope it as a region; Ada and Canyon Counties.

Chris Hopper said his intent with this request was to bring some regional coordination to several independent studies.

- There needs to be clearer definition. Too much is being taken on in 2013 regarding CIM. Focus, get it done, and then consider where to move on after that.
- Update Interim Foothills Transportation Analysis (502)
  - Fewer days may be needed than was estimated by staff.

**ARS Results:** High=2, Moderate=11, Low=0

- Canyon Highway District #4 Plan Support (503)
  - The District has been scoping work for the plan update in 2013-2014.

**ARS Results:** High=3, Moderate=9, Low=1

- Transit and Multi-Modal Planning (504):
  - Unclear of the role definition between Valley Regional Transit (VRT) and COMPASS in terms of transit planning. Why isn't this a VRT role?

Matt Stoll replied as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) we are required to do multi-modal planning. In the past, COMPASS has not done that much in the way of transit planning, which has been an issue with the certification review process. Part of the annual Consolidate Planning Grant comes from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

- The goal is integrated public transportation planning. It should be rephrased that it is not for VRT but it's for public transportation in a broader section; it's transit planning but it's also how Commuteride, planning for pedestrian, and bikes is used. Pull in other entities such as ACHD, Nampa's bike process, etc. so the other entities already doing their planning get some sort of collaboration process through COMPASS. Spell out the scope better in the UPWP.
- Some of the expectations and what is being requested is not planning (i.e., maintaining correct service in GIS map format). This is something VRT should be doing in-house.
- There is an estimated 77 – 107 work days but there is also a \$25,000 expected cost. Where is the \$25,000 coming from or do we have an identified source?

Mary Barker replied VRT currently does not do a rider/non-rider survey; which can be transit only, vanpool, and can include multi-modes. It is one of the Title VI tasks that VRT is required to do. It also feeds into the model done by MaryAnn Waldinger in terms of why people use or don't use the service, where they go, etc. The \$25,000 is for that survey. Walt Satterfield and Mary identified this as a need, it doesn't mean that money needs to come from COMPASS; it can come from grant money. There is a need to identify an ongoing funding source every couple of years. The concept is to gather consistent information over a period of time with consistent questions.

Regarding the GIS, VRT has funded the development of the GIS system with all the ADA bus stop improvements and routing (all in the GIS map). VRT would like to move it over to COMPASS to have in their system for planning and modeling. Updates to that system would be given to COMPASS. The base work is done. VRT does not have GIS capability in-house.

**ARS Results:** High=8, Moderate=3, Low=2

- Webpage Clearinghouse for Road Project Information (505):
  - When initially talking about the 511 project several years ago, we talked about having COMPASS play the role of being the clearinghouse of this road construction data. The COMPASS Board decided against COMPASS dedicating time toward this project.
  - This is being done by other people and there is little need for COMPASS involvement. There is confusion regarding the number of work days assigned to this task and its importance.
  - Perhaps COMPASS could play a role by letting the state know that the highway districts have this information and they could provide links to that information on their own systems. Why would the general public go to COMPASS for roadway construction information?

Matt replied the member agencies sitting around the table are the appropriate forum to provide the links.

- That level of support can be provided under General Membership services.

**ARS Results:** High=1, Moderate=0, Low=12

- Area of Influence Analysis (506):
  - This warrants four or five days, not the estimated 10 days.
  - This should go under Member Services because of the quick turnaround from MaryAnn Waldinger and Amar Pillai. However, if you are creating a program that you can make a request under, the 10 days may be rational under the process of trying to coordinate amongst all member agencies to establish a format but if not, it should go under Member Services.

**ARS Results:** High=9, Moderate=2, Low=2

- Policy Analysis for Integrated Implementation of Local and Regional Plans (507):
  - Why is this a separate task and not under CIM? This is information that all should be considering when looking at scenarios and moving forward the adoption of CIM. It should have been in the original scope of work for CIM.

Don replied this proposal is recommended to be part of CIM, not a separate project. The current CIM scope has three days allocated for implementation strategies; this proposal would add 11 days to CIM, for a total of 14 days on plan implementation.

- When the next CIM is done, we need to be careful when adding language that dictates a member agency to do something. The Screening Guidelines quote from CIM that “Member agencies will assess and modify their comprehensive plans and ordinances to support and be consistent with the preferred growth and transportation scenario envisioned under Community Choices.”

Matt replied the work plan approved for CIM in June last year, stipulated that type of language.

- We should discuss what COMPASS will do and what the members will do because if a lot of those days are member agency days, then it needs to be addressed.
- This task read as being an evaluation of our existing comprehensive plan and planning documents for alignment or areas of concern with the proposed CIM plan as it comes forward for 2040. This is not a best management issue but an individualized jurisdiction issue saying we’re coming out with a regional long-range transportation plan and there are areas where there is alignment and non-alignment. Going into a best management practice seems a step beyond its intent.

**ARS Results:** High=4, Moderate=3, Low=6

- Pilot Small Scale TOD (508):
  - TOD projects are not part of the COMPASS mandate to provide member services.
  - If this is something Garden City would like to do, they need to work with ACHD. If Garden City feels they cannot do this because of limited staff, we can find a way to do a public private partnership with landowners in that area. This not COMPASS’ job.
  - In terms of a TOD from VRT’s perspective, if we are going to do something like that, it would be nice to do it in an area that has transit and in a community that is helping to support transit.
  - To help agencies move something forward, it would be of value to develop a pilot or template that could be applied to other places.

Matt reminded the Committee that COMPASS receives membership dues as a Joint Powers Agreement agency. The Joint Powers Agreement was written in a way that has broad latitude at the discretion of the Board and recommendation of this Committee. Many of the comments being made are framed strictly toward the MPO function. There has been discussion among smaller members, cities, and rural highway districts about the value of belonging to COMPASS. We marginalize that investment into the organization if we strictly limit ourselves to what is done as an MPO and things regional in nature. They have to feel like they are getting some value back in participating and belonging to the organization.

- All member agencies pay dues in this organization. It shouldn't be on the backs of the entire organization to do specific area planning for a small organization. If this had come as a sincere effort with a match, with some ability to say we can leverage resources with you, we have a need, it has been thought through, there's a transit route; any of those components or a bit of all of them, it would have been more favorable. If we are going to use a regional organization, it can't be to do our basic functions as a local governmental entity. It can assist us in areas that we aren't able to complete but doing the basic duties is not the place we see the role of COMPASS to step in.

Matt replied there needs to be clarification that maybe at a later date this Committee should flesh out what you will consider so the smaller entities will have a better idea about what certain services they can ask for and at what point of time they will be taken more seriously.

- There are functions performed by ACHD because they have jurisdiction over the operations and expenditure of their funds. ACHD was not approached by Garden City and there are transportation funding dollars allocated for planning in Garden City. We need to have discussions with COMPASS regarding the roles of ACHD, COMPASS, and what will be done collectively.

**ARS Results:** High=0, Moderate=1, Low=12

- Location Efficiency/Affordable Housing (509) – combined with 512
- Water Rights and Land Use (510) - Withdrawn
- Meridian Interchange (511):
  - The City of Meridian would like VRT, ACHD, and ITD to be a part of this process. Meridian does not have the ability in-house to pull those things together. This requests COMPASS' assistance in bringing all the parties to the table in order to get feedback regarding the funding and construction of this design. Input from the private sector is also requested in rebuild of the interchange.

Toni Tisdale replied that ITD is putting the Meridian Interchange into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Michael Garz said ITD will put Meridian Interchange in the FY2013-2017 TIP.

- Construction is in 2017. Meridian would like to move something forward and talk design and concept with ITD.
- From a transit perspective the hours are high but a coordinated effort led outside the EIS process would be good. The EIS process in itself does not typically end up with a multi-modal solution. Having a coordination role would be good in terms of making sure we end up with a multi-modal solution. Meridian is a key hub for multi-modal use.
- As we move forward, the hours need to be adjusted; fewer work days may be needed.

**ARS Results:** High=9, Moderate=3, Low=1

- Regional Data Interface (512):
  - GIS staff said this is not ready to move forward. There needs to be more discussion, work, and coordination with the Regional Geographic Advisory Committee (RGAC) to contribute the data to make this work. RGAC should have a voice in this proposal.

**ARS Results:** High=3, Moderate=5, Low=5

- Census Workshop (513):
  - The estimated workdays should be changed from 15 to two or three work days. It can be put under General Membership services.
  - Past Census workshops were helpful. Staff at several agencies, particularly those involved with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, are familiar with grants and Census data and could be tapped for assistance.

**ARS Results:** High=3, Moderate=5, Low=5

- ACHD Support (514):
  - Sabrina Anderson explained ACHD's request.

**ARS Results:** High=10, Moderate=2, Low=1

- Research, Measure and Report Congestion (515):
  - Does everyone want to move forward? If the intent is that everyone wants to move forward believing this is a good exercise to align better, then it's good.
  - The current Sanderson Index being used does not communicate broadly to funding agencies for congestion purposes but we've used it for a number of years and we have historic trends that can usefully identify increasingly congested areas. Continuity is needed in order for the old data to merge well with the new.

- Need something on a regional basis in order for us to say we are looking at the same measurements in order to make the same policy decisions. That's the output that is needed.
- Looking at these projects overall, at least half of them could be placed under General Membership.

**ARS Results:** High=11, Moderate=1, Low=1

Don said he will email the ARS polling results to the Committee.

Tricia Nilsson suggested the Committee look at the work day requests more carefully.

Don reminded the Committee that a recommendation on the proposed projects is necessary to keep the UPWP development on track. The Finance Committee will meet on May 10, 2012 and needs the RTAC recommendation to move forward.

Clair Bowman suggested the Committee receive a final recommendation later by e-mail and vote via an email response. The recommendation would need a "date certain" deadline for responses.

After further discussion, **Sabrina Anderson moved and Tricia Nilsson seconded that COMPASS staff email to the Committee a list of the projects categorized as high, moderate, or low priority, based on polling results, and where included in keypad polling, the results for higher/lower workday options for projects, a deadline (date certain) for all replies, and the "cutoff" point for including projects in the UPWP. Motion passed unanimously.**

It was noted that anonymous ARS polling does not provide necessary information for weighted voting as prescribed in the Committee bylaws. The polling results would be used to prepare the priority list for the Committee; the members' email responses would provide the weighted voting necessary to satisfy the bylaws.

### **Information/Discussion Items**

#### **Review Draft FY2013-2017 Project List for Release for Public Involvement**

Toni Tisdale presented the draft project list.

Toni asked the Committee if they would like to see a list of all changes being made or just an update of the major changes.

A suggestion was made that Toni provide the Committee a list of accumulative changes.

#### **Overview of the Studies Coordination Website**

Due to time constraints, this item will be tabled until the next scheduled meeting.

### **OTHER**



**A. Next RTAC Meeting:** Wednesday, May 23, 2012, 10:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Nichoel Baird Spencer moved and Wendy Howell seconded adjournment at 11:06 a.m. Motion passed unanimously.**

T:\FY12\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RTAC\Minutes\minutes042512.docx