

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
DECEMBER 21, 2010 2:00-3:30 PM  
COMPASS CONFERENCE ROOM

**\*\* AGENDA \*\***



**I. Agenda Additions/Changes (2:00)**

**II. Open Discussion/Announcements**

**III. Consent Agenda**

Page 2 **\*A. Approve November 16, 2010, Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

*A copy of the draft November 16, 2010, Executive Committee meeting minutes is attached.*

**IV. Action Items**

Page 6 2:05 **\*A. Establish January 24, 2010, COMPASS Board Meeting**  
*Staff proposed agenda items for the annual meeting of the COMPASS Board scheduled January 24, 2010 are attached.*

2:10 **B. Recommend Board Officer Slate for Annual Meeting**  
*Matt Stoll will review nominations for the COMPASS Secretary/Treasurer position to be approved at the January 2011 COMPASS Board meeting.*

Page 12 2:20 **\*C. Consider Economic Impact Analysis Options**  
*Charles Trainor will review economic impact analysis options for Executive Committee consideration.*

Page 15 2:35 **\*D. Recommend Priorities for FY2012 Appropriations Applications**  
*Toni Tisdale will present alternative priorities for FY2012 appropriations applications.*

Page 17 2:50 **\*E. Provide Guidance for Surface Transportation Program and Priorities**  
*Toni Tisdale will review and seek guidance regarding the Surface Transportation Program and priorities.*

3:05 **F. Consider Canceling/Rescheduling February 15, 2011, Executive Committee Meeting**  
*COMPASS Board Chair David Ferdinand and Executive Director Matt Stoll will be at the NARC Conference in Washington D.C., February 13-16, 2011.*

**V. Information/Discussion Item**

3:10 **A. Status Report – Administrative Building**  
*Matt Stoll will provide a status report on the Administrative Building.*

**VI. Other (3:25)**

**VII. Adjournment (3:30)**

**\*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:\FY11\900 Operations\990 Direct Opertaions-Maintenance\Board\Exec\2011  
agendaminutes\agenda12212010.doc

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
NOVEMBER 16, 2010  
COMPASS CONFERENCE ROOM**



**\*\*MINUTES\*\***

**ATTENDEES:** Dave Bieter, Mayor, City of Boise, **Chair**  
Tom Dale, Mayor, City of Nampa  
Tammy de Weerd, Mayor, City of Meridian  
David Ferdinand, Commissioner, Canyon County,  
**Chair Elect**  
Carol McKee, Commissioner, Ada County Highway  
District, **Vice Chair**  
Garret Nancolas, Mayor, City of Caldwell,  
**Immediate Past Chair**  
Matt Stoll, Executive Director, Community  
Planning Association, Ex officio  
Vicki Thurber, Mayor, City of Middleton

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Bryce Millar, Commissioner, Nampa Highway  
District #1, **Secretary/Treasurer**  
Nathan Mitchell, Mayor, City of Star  
Rick Yzaguirre, Commissioner, Ada County

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Nancy Brecks, Community Planning Association  
Ken Burgess, Veritas Advisors  
Sally Goodell, Ada County Highway District  
Amy Luft, Community Planning Association  
Toni Tisdale, Community Planning Association  
Jeanne Urlezaga, Community Planning Association

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Elect Ferdinand called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

**AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES**

None.

**OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Matt Stoll stated that barring any last minute comments from Board members, he would be signing the final documents for the COMPASS administrative building on November 17, 2010.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **A. Approve September 21, 2010, Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Carol McKee moved and Tom Dale seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.**

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **A. Establish December 20, 2010, COMPASS Board Meeting**

Matt Stoll presented staff proposed Agenda Items 1-22 for the December 20, 2010, COMPASS Board meeting. Matt requested the latitude to adjust the agenda as necessary.

**After discussion, Tom Dale moved and Carol McKee seconded approval of Agenda Items 1-22 for the December 20, 2010, Board meeting as presented, and granted Matt the latitude to adjust the agenda as necessary. Motion passed unanimously.**

### **B. Authorize Solicitation of Nominations for CY2011 COMPASS Executive Committee**

Matt Stoll requested authorization to begin the nomination process for the Secretary-Treasurer Board officer position and small cities Executive Committee representatives.

Vicki Thurber stated she was willing to remain as the small cities representative from Canyon County.

**After discussion, Carol McKee moved and Tom Dale seconded approval for Matt to solicit nominations for the CY2011 COMPASS Executive Committee positions. Motion passed unanimously**

### **C. Review and Recommend 2011 State Legislative Position Statements**

Ken Burgess presented proposed 2011 state legislative position statements on the following:

1. Transportation Revenue
2. Local Option Tax Authority Legislation
3. Final Year Funding Approval of GARVEE Bonding Program
4. Inattentive Driving Legislation
5. Bicycle Safety Legislation
6. Transportation Access Plan Legislation.

(Chair Elect Ferdinand turned the meeting over to Chair Bieter at 2:23 pm.)

After discussion, **Tom Dale moved and David Ferdinand seconded to remove position statement No. 4, Inattentive Driving Legislation, from the list because it is not in character with other items on the list and does not fit the charge of COMPASS. Motion passed with two nay votes.**

After discussion, **Garret Nancolas moved and Tom Dale seconded to remove position statement No. 5, Bicycle Safety Legislation, from the list based on how the legislation is currently written and authorize support of legislation encouraging funding for pathways and bike paths making bicycle traffic safer.**

**Discussion:**

Ken Burgess asked for clarification that the direction was to redraft No. 5 to include more of an infrastructure component such as bike lanes and paths, rather than a law enforcement component.

Tom Dale said the motion was to support funding for those things.

Garret Nancolas said that was correct.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**D. Review and Recommend Approval Process for Congressional Legislative/Policy Positions**

Ken Burgess presented a draft five-step process for developing COMPASS congressional legislative/policy positions.

After discussion, **staff was directed to add a sixth step: the Executive Committee's decisions will be included as an Information/Discussion Item in the monthly Board packets.**

After discussion, **Garret Nancolas moved and Carol McKee seconded to recommend Board approval of the proposed process for Congressional legislative/policy positions with the addition of the sixth step as presented. Motion passed unanimously.**

**E. Authorize Travel Request for NARC/National Conference of Regions in February 2011**

Matt Stoll requested authorization for himself and a board officer to attend the NARC conference in February 2011. Ken Burgess will also be attending.

After discussion, **Garret Nancolas moved and Carol McKee seconded authorization to send the COMPASS Board Chair and Matt Stoll to the National Association of Regional Councils conference in February 2011. Motion passed unanimously.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Carol McKee moved and Garret Nancolas seconded adjournment at 3:39 pm.  
Motion passed unanimously.**

**Dated this 21st day of December 2010.**

**Approved:**

**By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dave Bieter, Chair  
Community Planning Association**

**Attest:**

**By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Matthew J. Stoll, Executive Director  
Community Planning Association**

T:\FY11\900 Operations\990 Direct Opertaions-Maintenance\Board\Exec\2011  
agendaminutes\minutes11162010.doc

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WORKSHEET FOR COMPASS BOARD AGENDA**

**ITEM IV-A**

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Title/Description</b>	<b>Mandatory<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Policy Implications/Requirements</b>	<b>Agenda Type<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Proposed Agenda</b>	<b>RTAC Agenda</b>	<b>Program No.</b>
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 - <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

<sup>1</sup> No, Yes, N/A (Not Applicable)

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

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Title/Description</i>	<i>Mandatory<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Policy Implications/Requirements</i>	<i>Agenda Type<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Presenter</i>	<i>Proposed Agenda</i>	<i>RTAC Agenda</i>	<i>Program No.</i>
11.	Status Report – Mobility Management	No	Liisa Itkonen will provide updates on work under mobility management.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	N/A	671 672
12.	Receive Administrative Modifications to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program	Yes	Toni Tisdale will provide memorandums of approval for Administrative Modifications.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	N/A	685
13.	Status Report – Reauthorization /Appropriations	No	Ken Burgess will provide a report on the status of Reauthorization/Appropriations.	Special Item	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	NA	685
14.	Status Report – Stimulus Funds	No	Toni Tisdale will provide a report on the status of Stimulus funds.	Special Item	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	N/A	685
15.	Status Report – Communities in Motion	Yes	Charles Trainor will provide updates on work under the regional long-range transportation plan.	Ex. Dir. Report	N/A	N/A	As Appropriate	N/A	661
<b>CURRENT AGENDA ITEMS</b>									
16.	Confirm Board Officers: Chair, Chair-Elect, Vice Chair, Immediate Past Chair. Elect Secretary-Treasurer	Yes	The COMPASS Bylaws require the Board to annually confirm the ascension of new Board Officers and elect a new Secretary-Treasurer.	Action	10	Matt Stoll	January	N/A	N/A
17.	Confirm Executive Committee Representation for Cities under 25,000 in Population	Yes	The COMPASS Bylaws require the Board to confirm Executive Committee representatives for cities under 25,000 in population.	Action	10	Matt Stoll	January	N/A	N/A
18.	Confirm Non-Elected Board Members and Alternates	Yes	The COMPASS Bylaws require the Board to confirm non-elected Board members and alternates.	Action	5	Matt Stoll	January	N/A	N/A
19.	Confirm Standing Committee Memberships	Yes	The COMPASS Bylaws require the Board to confirm Standing Committee memberships.	Action	5	Matt Stoll	January	N/A	N/A

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Title/Description</b>	<b>Mandatory<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Policy Implications/Requirements</b>	<b>Agenda Type<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Proposed Agenda</b>	<b>RTAC Agenda</b>	<b>Program No.</b>
20.	Review New Project Applications and Priorities for the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program	No	Staff will present new project applications and proposed ranking for information only.	Information/ Discussion	15	Toni Tisdale	January	December	685
21.	Review Memorandum of Understanding for coordinating and implementing activities in the State Street/Idaho 44 Corridor	No	Staff will present MOU between COMPASS and other agencies for coordination of activities in the State Street/Idaho 44 Corridor.	Information/ Discussion	10	Don Matson	January	N/A	720
<b>Upcoming Agenda Items</b>									
22.	Approve New Project Applications and Priorities for the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program	Yes	Staff will seek approval of new applications and priorities for funding in the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.	Action	10	Toni Tisdale	February	January	685
23.	Approve Memorandum of Understanding for Coordination and Implementation of activities in the State Street/Idaho 44 Corridor	No	Staff will seek approval of MOU between COMPASS and other agencies for coordination of activities in the State Street/Idaho 44 Corridor.	Action	10	Don Matson	February	N/A	720
24.	Review outreach activities and issues in requesting local/state agency adoption of <i>Communities in Motion 2035</i>	Yes	Staff will review activities to date, status of adoption, and issues raised.	Information/ Discussion	15	Charles Trainor	February	January	661
25.	Review proposed process to update <i>Communities in Motion 2040</i>	Yes	Staff will review proposed activities and calendar leading to the update of <i>Communities in Motion</i> by September 2014.	Information/ Discussion	20	Charles Trainor	February	February	661
26.	Workshop – Regional Plan for Sustainable Development	No	COMPASS staff will facilitate discussion about pros and cons of regional sustainability planning.	Workshop	60	Liisa Itkonen	March	January	N/A

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Title/Description</b>	<b>Mandatory<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Policy Implications/Requirements</b>	<b>Agenda Type<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Proposed Agenda</b>	<b>RTAC Agenda</b>	<b>Program No.</b>
27.	Review "Reality Check" process that kicks off the <i>Communities in Motion 2040</i> process	Yes	COMPASS staff will review how growth and allocation assumptions will be reviewed in cooperation with ULI.	Information/Discussion	20	Charles Trainor	March	February	661
28.	Receive 2011 Population Estimates	No	Staff will present the 2011 population estimates.	Information/Discussion	20	Carl Miller	March	February (DAC)	620
29.	Review findings and recommendations of State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan	No	Staff will provide overview of findings and recommendations from the State Street TTOP.	Information/Discussion	10	Don Matson	March	February	720
30.	Approve FY2012 General and Special Membership Dues	Yes	Staff will seek approval of FY2011 General and Special Membership Dues estimates.	Action	10	Matt Stoll	April	N/A	601
31.	Review status of local/state agency adoption of <i>Communities in Motion 2035</i>	Yes	Staff will review activities to date and status of adoption.	Information/Discussion	20	Charles Trainor	April	March	661
32.	Approve Release of the Draft FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for Public Involvement	Yes	Staff will seek approval to release the draft FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement project list for public involvement.	Action	15	Toni Tisdale	June	May	685
33.	Receive 2011 Performance Monitoring Report	No	COMPASS staff will review the 2011 Performance Monitoring Report.	Information/Discussion	20	Carl Miller	June	May	620
34.	Adopt Resolution Approving the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and Air Quality Conformity Demonstration	Yes	Staff will seek approval of the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and Air Quality Conformity Demonstration.	Action	15	Toni Tisdale	August	July	685
35.	Approve Mirroring Changes to the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program	Yes	Staff will seek approval of final changes to the FY2011-2015 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.	Action	10	Toni Tisdale	September	August	685

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Title/Description</b>	<b>Mandatory<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Policy Implications/Requirements</b>	<b>Agenda Type<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Proposed Agenda</b>	<b>RTAC Agenda</b>	<b>Program No.</b>
36.	Present findings of "Reality Check" process that kicks off the <i>Communities in Motion 2040</i> process	Yes	COMPASS staff will review growth and allocation recommendations.	Information/ Discussion	25	Charles Trainor	September	August	661
37.	Review Complete Streets studies and policy	No	COMPASS staff will review complete streets studies and seek approval of an update to the complete streets policy.	Action	20	Carl Miller	October	September DAC	710
38.	Approve findings of "Reality Check" process that kicks off the <i>Communities in Motion 2040</i> process	Yes	COMPASS staff will seek approval of growth and allocation recommendations.	Action	20	Charles Trainor	TBD	TBD Demographic Advisory Comm.	661
39.	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
40.	Workshop – Funding Transportation	No	What if a local option tax provided \$100 million more per year for transportation? The workshop would have the Board consider its priorities for allocation.	Workshop	60	Charles Trainor Amy Luft	TBD	N/A	N/A
41.	Workshop - Integration of Blueprint for Good Growth Work into COMPASS planning	No	COMPASS staff will discuss how comprehensive plan and cumulative development evaluations can be integrated into planning, programming and development reviews.	Workshop		Charles Trainor	TBD	TBD	761
42.	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
43.	Workshop – TIP Protocol, Guidebook, and Grouping	No	COMPASS staff will discuss the new TIP protocol, Guidebook and Grouping of projects in detail.	Workshop	30	Toni Tisdale	TBD	TBD	685

<b>Item #</b>	<b>Title/Description</b>	<b>Mandatory<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Policy Implications/Requirements</b>	<b>Agenda Type<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Proposed Agenda</b>	<b>RTAC Agenda</b>	<b>Program No.</b>
44.	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
45.	Review findings and recommendations of Idaho 44 Access Management Plan	No	Staff and consultant will present finding and recommendations in the technical report and plan.	Information/Discussion	10	Don Matson	TBD	CPC TBD	610
46.	Approve Idaho 44 Access Management Plan	No	Staff will seek acceptance Access Management Plan.	Consent Agenda	N/A	Don Matson	TBD	CPC TBD	610
47.	Review findings and recommendations of US 20/26 Corridor Environmental Assessment (EA)	No	Staff and consultants will present findings and recommendations from studies.	Information/Discussion	10	Don Matson	TBD	CPC TBD	611
48.	Review findings and recommendations of Idaho 44 Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	No	Consultant will present findings and recommendations from studies.	Information/Discussion	10	Don Matson	TBD	CPC TBD	610



**COMPASS**  
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION  
of Southwest Idaho

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** COMPASS Executive Committee

**FROM:** Charles Trainor, Principal Planner

**DATE:** November 17, 2010

**RE:** **Economic Impact Analysis Options**

### **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Consider options and provide direction regarding desired approach of economic impact analysis.

### **BACKGROUND:**

Over the past year, COMPASS has prepared federal grant applications that required extensive evaluations of the economic benefits of the proposed projects. At the state level, Governor Otter has stressed the tie between transportation investment and economic growth, with a likelihood that future revenue increases may depend on demonstrating economic benefits. Improving COMPASS' ability to evaluate projects and programs can enhance our opportunities to fund regional transportation projects and services.

### **STATUS:**

Traditional economic evaluations of transportation focused on a benefit/cost ratio using travel time savings, fuel savings and safety improvement. The sum of these benefits across time was compared to the construction cost, balancing to the present value.

This approach remains a valid way to consider alternative investments. But state and national emphasis is being put on the economic and job growth potential of transportation. A simplistic approach is to calculate the direct job creation resulting from the project. For example, a \$30 million roadway project could result in 540 jobs during the life of the project, based on a factor of 18 construction jobs per one million dollars worth of construction expenditure. But under this approach, when the construction is done, so are the job benefits.

A somewhat more sophisticated approach is being used by the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). ITD has acquired a number of licenses from Economic Modeling Specialists, Inc. (EMSI) of Moscow, ID. The EMSI model is an input-output model that evaluates economic benefits based on the size and complexity of the region. Larger, more diverse regions retain more of the direct expenditures and recirculate these dollars in the local economy. EMSI provides the data to calculate the economic benefit thereby accruing to the region. ITD paid \$18,000 for its licenses and will pay an annual fee to get updates. The fees do include training.

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

The type of economic model provided by EMSI is a “static” model in that the economic returns are based on current, fixed economic relationships. A static model provides reasonable information for short-term economic benefits, but it does not account for growth and change across time. For example, would a major firm in the region see an increase in its market and exports based on a significant improvement in transportation? That growth would then translate into added jobs and a greater economic benefit than would be seen under the static model.

This calculation of growth based upon the interaction of the transportation investment and economic conditions is a “dynamic” model. Dynamic models work with a variety of inputs and are used to “...supplement input-output relationships with simulation techniques to forecast the year-to-year effects of projects on economic and demographic patterns.”<sup>1</sup> These models may integrate travel demand models, land use models, dynamic simulation economic models, and input-output models.

Dynamic models are more often used in larger metropolitan areas or by state agencies due to the costs for software, data and on-going maintenance. These models may be more appropriate for larger projects affecting the region or for consideration of a program of improvements or services. The Montana Department of Transportation is using a dynamic model to evaluate transportation investments statewide. The metropolitan planning organization for the Albuquerque, New Mexico area, the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), also uses a dynamic model. Montana DOT and MRCOG both use a commercial software/data package from Regional Economic Model, Inc. (REMI).

The cost to MRCOG was an initial payment of \$80,000 with an annual fee of up to \$30,000. In addition MRCOG pays for data to supplement the REMI model and dedicates 0.25 full time equivalent staff to operate the model. MRCOG is in the process of expanding the REMI model to do project prioritization. The MRCOG region is similar to the COMPASS region in terms of population, with approximately 700,000 people in four counties. The Montana DOT also uses REMI for prioritization.

Whichever approach is used, there are concerns that the model not be a “black box” in which an economic benefit is calculated without any understanding as to how the numbers were produced or what the limitations are. Other common caveats in the literature regarding the relationship of transportation investments to economic benefits are:

- The role of transportation investments in stimulating economic growth diminishes as transportation capacity overall increases. A study applying the Montana DOT approach to Wisconsin found similar results to Montana in that new job creation was small when considering any single transportation investment.<sup>2</sup> The Wisconsin study recommended that the economic analysis tool be used only for very large projects or combinations of projects.

---

<sup>1</sup> Economic Analysis Primer. Economic Impact Analysis. Federal Highway Administration website at <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure/asstmgmt/primer08.cfm#s3>.

<sup>2</sup> Horowitz, Alan J. et. al. “Transferability of the Business Attraction Module in the Highway Economic Analysis Tool” University of Wisconsin-Madison. 2008.

- Other factors such as labor markets, energy, proximity to related industries, and global markets need to be considered. These often have a stronger bearing on job creation or industry growth.
- Shifts of economic activity within a region versus real growth must be accounted for. (For example, a new shopping center associated with a new interchange may simply draw dollars away from existing shopping centers.)
- There is a critical need to survey local businesses and involve them in the analysis, especially regarding likely business response to transportation investments, travel time improvements and the other factors involved in economic expansion.

### **Options:**

1. Participate with ITD in the EMSI model. Direct costs would be substantially lower than the REMI model if COMPASS could piggyback on the ITD agreement with EMSI. Staff time to use model would be approximately 0.25 full time equivalent (FTE), including on-going data collection and analysis.
  - a. Pros: lower cost and ease of use, quicker start up. Could be implemented while laying the groundwork for the second or third option.
  - b. Cons: not useful to depict long-term economic benefits. Cannot assess interaction with economic expansion.
2. Purchase the REMI model or similar product. Direct costs would be similar to Albuquerque, NM (\$50-\$80,000 up front plus annual maintenance) with likely staff time of up to 0.5 FTE for data collection and analysis.
  - a. Pros: greater ability to evaluate long-term economic effects. Provides a more robust economic evaluation and one that is more likely to meet federal requirements for competitive grants. Utility as overall prioritization tool, similar to Montana.
  - b. Cons: higher direct and staff costs, longer time to implement. Limited application to larger projects. Analyses would not be comparable with other in-state projects. May not be cost effective.
3. Participate with ITD in purchasing the REMI model or similar product.
  - a. Pros: pooled approach more likely to use full capacity of the dynamic model. Sharing of data, especially at regional and state levels. Cost sharing for software and data. Uniform approach.
  - b. Cons: contingent upon ITD/state cooperation.

### **Recommendation:**

Options 2 or 3 should be pursued. Option 3 would provide more effective implementation by integrating state financial, staff and data resources, but Option 2 would still provide better long-term evaluation of economic benefits. Option 2 would require a greater commitment of COMPASS staff time, particularly in the first year to learn the software and build the data base to run the model. On-going staff time would be 0.5 FTE.



## MEMORANDUM

**To:** COMPASS Executive Committee  
**From:** Toni Tisdale, Principal Planner  
**Date:** December 15, 2010  
**Re:** **FY2012 Appropriation Priorities**

**Action requested:**

Recommend approval for FY2012 Appropriation priorities.

**Background:**

In August 2010, the Executive Committee recommended a minimal effort approach to the FY2012 Appropriation application process based on the current political climate. The Ada County highway priority, Franklin Road, has been funded through the Surface Transportation Program. Therefore, a new highway project in Ada County has been recommended for submittal, and is provided as Attachment 1.

**Status:**

A subcommittee of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee met on December 15, 2010, and recommended State Street Improvements, Ada County, Idaho – (\$1,500,000) for the FY2012 Appropriations application.

Valley Regional Transit wants to increase the amount of their Transit Facilities application to \$1,000,000 to add a park and ride lot on the College of Western Idaho campus. The college donated the land, which can be used for local match. The site would also be used as a transfer center.

Attachment: FY2012 Appropriations Recommendation  
pc: 685.03

TT:nb T:\FY11\700 Services\760 Legislative Services\Appropriations  
2012\101215mmoExecApprop.doc

Attachment 1  
FY2012 Appropriations Recommendation

Roadway Priority

1. State Street Improvements, Ada County, Idaho – (\$1,500,000) – This project will begin implementation of planned improvements to meet the needs of all users of the State Street corridor by creating a multi-modal corridor supported by a sustainable land development pattern. This project will complete concept work on four intersections; complete a Land Use Master Plan for the area surrounding the corridor; and design multiple segments of sidewalks along State Street (SH 44) through the cities of Boise, Garden City, and Eagle, where there is no sidewalk today. This project meets the vision of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and Department of Transportation (DOT) Partnership for Sustainable Communities initiative by evaluating and applying cross jurisdictional solutions toward a complete multi-modal transportation on a corridor connecting Idaho's major employment center with housing and essential human services.

Transit Priorities

1. Treasure Valley, Idaho Transit Facilities (\$1,000,000) - This project will fund site location, acquisition, required environmental analysis, and construction for up to four transfer centers, park and ride lots, and/or administrative and maintenance facilities to improve transit services in western Ada and Canyon Counties, Idaho. The development of transit facilities is a recommendation in the regional transit plan which characterizes these transit facilities as crucial to the success of the transit system
2. Treasure Valley High Capacity Alternatives Analysis (\$3,130,000) - This project will analyze the I-84 travel corridor in Ada and Canyon Counties, Idaho and examine options for preservation of alternative rights-of-way in the same corridor including existing rail corridors. Preservation of the Boise Cutoff rail corridor is an approved project in SAFETEA-LU (Project No. 22) with no identified funding. The goals of this project are consistent with the project included in SAFETEA-LU.

T:\FY11\700 Services\760 Legislative Services\Appropriations 2012\2012 Detail Priority Recommendations2.docx



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** COMPASS Executive Committee  
**FROM:** Toni Tisdale, Principal Planner  
**DATE:** December 15, 2010  
**RE:** **New Projects and Rankings for the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**

### **ACTION REQUESTED:**

Review new projects and rankings for the FY2012-2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

### **BACKGROUND:**

Applications for new Surface Transportation Program projects in the FY2012-2016 Regional TIP were scored and ranked by a Scoring Subcommittee of the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC). After discussion, the Scoring Committee and RTAC determined there were questions they considered to be policy related and requested Executive Committee guidance. The recommendations, as currently proposed, are provided as Attachment 1.

### **STATUS:**

The three policy related questions are:

1. The Treasure Valley High Capacity Alternatives Analysis in the I-84 Corridor (\$3,180,000) and the State Street Alternatives Analysis (\$1,851,000) are possibilities for recommended funding. **Which Alternatives Analysis project is the priority? Should the decision be delayed until a transit corridor prioritization process is developed?**
2. In the Nampa Urbanized Area, two projects received high priority status, 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue Widening, Chicago to Cleveland (Caldwell) (\$2,505,000), and Canyon County Bus Operations and Maintenance Facility (Valley Regional Transit) (\$1,697,554). Staff anticipates only one project will be able to be placed into Preliminary Development. Movement of projects is reliant on the Urban Balancing Committee. **Which project has the priority?**
3. The current recommendation contains a high percentage of the program in studies and special projects, especially if one of the Alternative Analysis projects is funded. Current policy directs up to 10% of funds (approximately \$585,000 in FY2016) to be programmed for such projects. **Would over-programming studies and special projects in Preliminary Development be considered?**

Attachment: Scoring Matrix

pc: 685.03

TT: nb T:\FY11\600 Projects\685 TIP\1216 TIP\101215mmoExecScoring.doc

Scoring Matrix  
Project Recommendations for FY2012-2016 TIP Update

Approximate amounts available for FY2016: Northern Ada County - \$5.8 M, Nampa Urbanized Area - \$1.5M  
(Some earlier years are also under-programmed.)

**Off-the-Top**

Northern Ada County

Nampa Urbanized Area

Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount	Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount
ACHD Commuteride, Ada County	1	Y	\$220,000	\$220,000	ACHD Commuteride, Canyon County	1	Y	\$55,000	\$55,000
COMPASS Planning	2	Y	\$331,000	\$331,000					

**Mandatory/Special Projects**

Studies

Northern Ada County

Nampa Urbanized Area

Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount	Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount
Communities in Motion (Mandatory Study) (COMPASS)	1	N	\$475,000	\$400,000					
<b>Treasure Valley High Capacity Alternatives in the I-84 Corridor (COMPASS)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>\$3,130,000</b>	<b>Possible</b>					
<b>State Street Alternatives Analysis (COMPASS)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>\$1,851,000</b>	<b>Possible</b>					
State Street Access Management Plan (COMPASS)	3	N	\$61,000	\$61,000					
Travel Survey and Transit On-Board Data Collection (Mandatory Study) (COMPASS)	5	N	\$350,000	\$350,000					
Continuous Flow Corridor Concept Study (COMPASS)	6	N	\$126,000	0					
Bowtie Corridor Concept Study	6	N	\$98,000	0					

Paved Pathway  
Northern Ada County

Nampa Urbanized Area

Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount	Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount
State Street, Glenwood Street to Collister Drive, Pedestrian Improvements, Phase I (ACHD)	1	Y	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Green Belt Extension to Curtis Park, Bike/Walk Path (Caldwell)	1	Y	\$746,000	0

Transportation Demand Management

Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount	Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount
Mobility Program Transportation Demand Management (VRT)	1	Y	\$150,000	0					

**Capital Projects**

Transit  
Northern Ada County

Nampa Urbanized Area

Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount	Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount
BSU Park and Ride (VRT)	1	Y	\$482,000 - \$1,855,524	\$1,000,000	<b>Canyon County Bus Operations and Maintenance Facility (VRT)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>\$1,697,554</b>	<b>Possible</b>
					College of Western Idaho Park and Ride (VRT)	2	Y	\$1,752,488	0

Highway  
Northern Ada County

Nampa Urbanized Area

Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount	Project	Priority	Passes Go/No Go*	Requested Funding Amount	Recommended Funding Amount
Ustick Road and Meridian Road Intersection	1	Y	\$2,930,000	\$2,930,000	<b>21<sup>st</sup> Avenue Widening, Chicago to Cleveland (Caldwell)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>\$2,505,000</b>	<b>Possible</b>
					Simplot Boulevard and Centennial Way Roundabout (Caldwell)	2	N	\$2,381,000	
					Cherry Lane and Can-Ada Intersection Rebuild (Nampa)	3	Y	\$3,930,000	
					Middleton Road and Ustick Road Intersection (Caldwell)	4	N	\$950,000	
					Middleton Road and Murphy Road Realignment (Middleton)	5	Y	\$3,347,000	
					Bridge Replacement Historic Plymouth Street Steel Bridge (Caldwell)	6	N	\$4,614,000	

**Maintenance Projects (Not accepting applications this year)**

- VRT Boise Fixed Line Vehicle Replacement (VRT) - \$1,500,000
- 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue ITS and Overlay (Caldwell) - \$1,091,000

Notes:

Gray shading signifies project recommended for funding.

Gray shading with **bold text** signifies project is possibly recommended but committee requests Board decision between two projects.

\*Y= Project passes "Go/No Go" criteria, N= Project does not pass "Go/No Go" criteria (in all cases this year, there is not a complete Resolution that includes the sponsor will pay match and maintain the facility).

Final recommended years of funding will be discussed by the Balancing committees. At this time, staff believes multiple projects can be funded in the TMA (Boise Urbanized Area) program, but only one project can be added to the Urban (Nampa Urbanized Area) program.

T:\FY11\600 Projects\685 TIP\1216 TIP\Scoring\ScoringMatrixDraft-nobonus.doc