



**REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DECEMBER 16, 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  
Jennifer Carson, Canyon County Development Services  
Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation  
Doug Foye, Boise State University (*for Jared Everett*)  
Stephen Freiburger, Nampa Highway District #1  
Scott Gurnsey, Idaho Transportation Department-  
District 3  
Caleb Hood, City of Meridian  
Wendy Howell, City of Middleton  
Megan Johnson, Ada County Development Services  
Kathleen Lacey, City of Boise  
Jeff Lowe, City of Eagle, **Vice Chair**  
Don Matson, COMPASS (*Ex-Officio*)  
Sarah Stobaugh, Boise Independent School District  
Leslie Toombs, Ada County Highway District (*for Gary  
Inselman*)  
Jim Voorhees, Canyon Highway District #4
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Anne Horn, Mayor, City of Notus  
Rob Howarth, Central District Health Department (*Ex-  
Officio*)  
David Luft, Department of Environmental Quality  
Brent Orton, City of Caldwell, **Chair**  
Deanna Smith, Public Participation Committee  
Mary Shaw Taylor, City of Star  
Jenah Thornborrow, City of Garden City  
Margie Watson, Mayor, City of Parma
- OTHERS PRESENT:** Chris Danley, Iteris  
Ryan Head, COMPASS  
Liisa Itkonen, COMPASS  
Eric Lindstrom, Kittelson & Associates  
Amy Luft, COMPASS  
Sai Kumar Sarepalli, Holladay Engineering Company  
Toni Tisdale, COMPASS  
Charles Trainor, COMPASS  
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chair Lowe called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

## **AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES**

Don Matson stated he will give a brief review of Status Report item VI-F, Articles for Your Information.

## **OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Approve November 18, 2009 Meeting Minutes**
- B. Approve RTAC Meeting Dates for Calendar Year 2010**

Jon Cecil commented that on page 3 of the minutes, last paragraph, the word "ever" should be changed to "*every.*"

**Jon Cecil moved and Mary Barker seconded to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.**

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- A. Recommend Approval to Amend the FY2009-2013 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Toni Tisdale presented the amendment to the FY2009-2013 TIP.

**Mary Barker moved and Wendy Howell seconded to recommend approval of the FY2009-2013 Regional Transportation Improvement Program as amended. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.**

Toni said there is a possibility of additional funding coming through Stimulus for transit. The deadlines for transit are different; projects have to be in the Transportation Electronic Award Management (TEAM) system by December 31<sup>st</sup>. Therefore, staff may know by Friday if Valley Regional Transit (VRT) will receive an additional \$720,000. If that comes through, VRT will apply it towards additional buses in Nampa.

Mary Barker replied that VRT already has that project in the TIP and the funds have been obligated. Therefore, additional funds would go to a project that already exists.

## **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- A. Review New Project Applications for the FY2011-2015 TIP**

Toni Tisdale explained the review process, new project applications, and scoring outcomes.

## **Discussion:**

- If you are putting the projects in the order shown and also show the ranking scores, it looks like they were cross-prioritized and the system does not cross-prioritize. If the scores need to be listed, list them somewhere else when presenting the information.
- The subcommittee took a long time working through the scores. The scores need to remain on the list and it is hoped that the Board understands that scoring is just the first step.
- Create separate tables for Capital Projects, Maintenance Projects, and Special Projects. Projects will then be ranked against each other in the same categories.

After further discussion, Toni said the table will be reworked and forwarded to the committee for review and comment.

## **B. Discuss Federal Funding Consideration for Unfunded Corridors in *Communities in Motion***

Charles Trainor stated the plan update will not be formally adopted until August 2010 and many more corridors will go onto the unfunded corridors list. Charles requested input on how COMPASS should address federal funding prioritization for projects in corridors deemed unfunded in *Communities in Motion* (CIM).

## **Discussion:**

- The main concern has to be on the priority corridors in CIM. If we need to think about other ways to categorize projects that are not on CIM corridors, that is a different question. The goal of this committee, and COMPASS, is to focus on CIM.
- It is important for this committee to come up with a process of how to take those unfunded corridors that are still priorities within the CIM context and move them from unfunded to the funded list with the CIM process. Those corridors fell off the list not because they weren't priority corridors (they were corridors listed in the original CIM) but it has to be fiscally constrained, which is why those corridors were removed.
- The term "illustrative" is no longer referenced in the CIM update. How does a project come off the unfunded list should new funding become available? We need to think about how to identify those projects.
- A lot of time is spent on CIM, and the projects listed in the funded list are the projects that should be eligible for capital improvements and if the projects we want are not being funded, there is something wrong with the plan. The term "illustrative" should remain and not be changed to "unfunded." Maintenance projects need to be listed as well.
- The projects that were dropped off were within the CIM parameters, they just dropped off for lack of identified funding sources. These projects are still a priority within the CIM corridors and funding sources should be sought for these projects.

- Continue corridor studies in CIM with “illustrative” for unfunded projects. There will be changes in the future on federal and state funding requirements. Projects need to be identified so they can move forward when there is an increase in funding.
- Language should be added to the plan as to where dollars can go. There is nothing in the plan currently that states that unfunded projects cannot seek federal dollars.

Charles said there is time to work on the plan; there are a lot more projects on the funded list under the current plan.

- Discussion of the prioritization system needs to be addressed as its own agenda item.
- The Board has the power to make the funding scope much more limited than CIM specifies. The plan is what the feds will accept and the Board can set tighter criteria and we need to abide by their decision.

Charles replied that RTAC, as an advisory committee, has the ability to advise the Board as to how the prioritization process should or could work. Charles commented that he is reluctant to try and interpret the feelings for consensus of this committee at this time.

Vice Chair Lowe said that in the interest of time, further discussion of this item will be brought back to RTAC at the next scheduled meeting.

### **C. Review Implications of Unfunded Corridors**

Charles Trainor reviewed transportation implications of the shift of corridors to unfunded in the *Communities in Motion* process and results of the travel demand analysis. These results have been shared with the Governor’s Task Force to illustrate the benefits of increasing investment in transportation. More evaluation will be done.

### **D. Discuss Evaluation of the Preservation Scenario**

Charles Trainor reviewed options for evaluating the comprehensive plan build out (preservation scenario).

#### **Discussion:**

- It is time to start an influential education campaign regarding the imperative need for transit; help people to think that if we’re adding additional lanes that we need to be thinking about high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and specialized express transit systems (rail corridor).
- A suggestion was made that before these numbers go to the Governor’s Board, that the unconstrained optimal includes the appropriate transit system laid over the appropriate road system. The optimal solution is not roads by itself or transit by itself, but a combination of the two.
- While capacity and transit are certainly parts of the equation, there are other solutions that can be gathered from many areas close to this region.

**E. Follow-up on Access Management Toolkit/Additional Resources**

In the interest of time, this item was tabled until the next scheduled meeting.

**F. Discuss Construction and Studies Coordination**

Ryan Head stated the Studies Coordination webpage has been updated to reflect changes which have occurred in studies throughout the Treasure Valley.

**STATUS REPORT**

**F. Articles for Your Information**

Don Matson commented that two interesting items occurred after the Status Report was forwarded to the committee (these items will be included in the January 2010 Status Report):

- The U.S. House of Representatives' Transportation and Infrastructure Committee had a formal hearing to receive a report on how funds are being spent.
- An article was developed by Phoenix news that within the past 12 months automobile drivers are having trouble getting used to dealing with the light rail trains resulting in 51 accidents. The article also mentions a huge problem in Houston when that city opened its first light-rail line several years ago. A study was also released of 50 light rail systems around the continent and their accident records in dealing with pedestrian and driver safety next to the light rail lines. These concerns may get translated to street car issues.

**OTHER**

**A. Next Meeting:** Wednesday, January 27, 2010, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Wendy Howell moved and Stephen Freiburger seconded adjournment at 10:52 a.m. Motion carries.**