



Interagency Consultation Committee

June 4, 2009 – 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
Community Planning Association

Notice: The online document requires Adobe Acrobat to read it; COMPASS' homepage <http://www.compassidaho.org> (under "Committees") contains a free download link. The online document includes bookmarks at the left of the screen that are named to correspond to agenda items that have attachments. Clicking on a bookmark will take you directly to the named document.

**** AGENDA ****

I. Agenda Additions/Changes

9:00

II. Open Discussion/Announcements/Introductions

9:05

III. Consent Agenda

9:10 *A. Approve the September 30, 2008 Meeting Minutes

IV. Action Items

9:15 *A. Approve FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Emissions Analysis Modeling Assumptions MaryAnn Waldinger

V. Information/Discussion Items

9:40 *A. Review FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Emissions Analysis - Draft Project List MaryAnn Waldinger
Discuss the draft transportation project list for the regional emissions analysis.

10:00 *B. Review Chair and Vice Chair Rotation MaryAnn Waldinger

In late 2006, the ICC included a rotation order for Chair and Vice Chair.

VI. Other

10:25 A. Next Meeting Chair

VII. Adjournment

10:30 Chair

***Attachments will be distributed 14 days prior to the meeting.**

**INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 30, 2008
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**



****MINUTES****

- ATTENDEES:** Beth Baird, City of Boise, **Vice Chair**
Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit (*for Rick Thompson, Chair*)
Jorge Garcia, IDEQ
Cecelia Hockett, ACHD Commuteride
Ron Kerr, Idaho Transportation Department
Andrew O'Connor, ACHD
MaryAnn Waldinger, COMPASS
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Scott Frey, FHWA (*Ex-Officio*)
Greg Vitley, Idaho Transportation Department – District 3
- OTHERS PRESENT:** Lee Coe, COMPASS
Carl Miller, COMPASS
Toni Tisdale, COMPASS
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice Chair Baird called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Introductions were made of all attendees.

MaryAnn Waldinger stated that Yancey Willis was no longer with COMPASS and Lee Coe, Assistant Planner, will be doing transportation modeling and has an interest in air quality issues.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

None.

OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve the July 22, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Cecelia Hockett stated that under Others Present, Greg Inselman should be changed to **Gary** Inselman.

Cecelia Hockett moved and Kelli Fairless seconded to approve the July 22, 2008 meeting minutes as amended. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEM

A. Approve Outline of Protocols

MaryAnn Waldinger presented for approval, the proposed protocols for informing the ICC of major activities of the demographic and travel demand model.

Kelli Fairless commented that it may be helpful to include in future committee emails, a statement of why a particular theme would be of interest to this group.

After discussion, **Kelli Fairless moved and Cecelia Hockett seconded to approve the Outline of Protocols as presented. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.**

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Review UPlan Land Use Model and TAZ Workshop Summary

Carl Miller presented an update on the UPlan land use model, summarized the workshop results, and reviewed the next steps.

MaryAnn stated that staff is also scheduling a workshop for the Transportation Modeling Advisory Committee (TMAC) that was also done for the small cities. Some of the TMAC members have been involved in comprehensive plans or master transportation plans which brings in a planning perspective. The ICC may also have the opportunity to sit in on various TMAC meetings.

Carl commented that the Demographic Advisory Committee (DAC) has participated in good discussions regarding broad ways of doing the population forecast and then filtering them down into three or four different methods to come up with a 2035 horizon control total. Carl said a write-up on the various methods used, together with their advantages and disadvantages will be forwarded to the ICC. MaryAnn presented an overview of the 2035 population forecast as presented to the DAC.

MaryAnn then provided a review of traffic analysis zones (TAZs) jurisdictional boundaries and refinements as presented to the DAC and TMAC.

B. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Development

Toni Tisdale presented an update on the development of the Regional TIP and future funding scenarios.

C. COMPASS' Technical Committee Summary

MaryAnn Waldinger presented a summary of the roles and responsibilities of COMPASS' standing technical committees that was given in response to a request made at the ICC's July 2008 meeting.

Toni Tisdale reviewed the mission of the Transportation Management Area Balancing Committee.

MaryAnn stated that she will create a list of sub-groups and sub-committees (non-standing committees).

Kelli Fairless suggested presenting a summary of COMPASS' standing technical committees, and non-standing committees, as an information item to the COMPASS Board.

D. Transportation Project Categorization

MaryAnn Waldinger reviewed the elements and challenges regarding the inclusion of illustrative and preservation only roadway projects in the conformity networks.

OTHER

A. Next Meeting: To Be Determined.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Interagency Consultation Committee
FROM: MaryAnn Waldinger, Principal Planner
DATE: May 20, 2009
RE: Approve the FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Emissions Analysis Modeling Assumptions

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approve the emissions estimation assumptions and methodologies as drafted for use in the FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Regional Emissions Analysis.

BACKGROUND:

The ICC is required to review and approve the assumptions and emissions estimation methodologies used in regional emissions analyses. These analyses are conducted for transportation conformity purposes per state and federal regulations. Any Northern Ada County TIP or long-range transportation plan must demonstrate conformity to the motor vehicle emissions budgets for particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) established by the Northern Ada County PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan. A regional emissions analysis is not federally required for carbon monoxide (CO). However, Northern Ada County's Limited Maintenance Plan for CO requires COMPASS to conduct a build/no build emissions analysis for local planning purposes.

STATUS:

COMPASS is developing the FY2010-2014 TIP. As a result, COMPASS staff is preparing to conduct a regional emissions analysis to support a conformity finding for the TIP. The Northern Ada County PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan established motor vehicle emissions budgets for the years 1999, 2010, and 2015. Thus, budget tests will be performed for:

- 2010 - Base year of the FY2010-2014 TIP and Budget year
- 2014 - Last year of the TIP
- 2015 - Budget year
- 2025 - Intermediate analysis year, as there can be no more than 10 years between analysis years
- 2030 – Long-range transportation plan (*Communities in Motion*) horizon year

Attached are three detailed summaries of the tools and methodologies proposed for use in the upcoming regional emissions analysis. Attachment 1 displays the proposed MOBILE6.2 input assumptions. Attachment 2 explains the data estimation methodologies. Attachment 3 describes the current version of COMPASS' travel demand model and demographic assumptions. The proposed assumptions in all three attachments are the same as those approved in May 2008 by the ICC for use in the FY2009-2013 TIP Regional Emissions Analysis.

Attachments (3)
pc: 685.01

MW: dw\FY08\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Packets\may608\FY09-13 TIP REA.docX

Attachment 1: Proposed FY 2009-2013 TIP MOBILE6.2 Model Input Assumptions

Parameter:	Proposed FY 2009-2013 TIP:	Previously Presented:	Note:
Fleet Mix	EPA MOBILE6.2 defaults, based on national fleet mix data.	Same	COMPASS will continue working with IDEQ and ITD to develop local fleet characteristics for use in Treasure Valley emissions modeling.
I/M Program	Two Annual programs: 1) Two speed test (idle and 2500 RPM) for pre 1996 vehicles only. Waiver Rates (pre 1981 & 1981 or newer) = 1.0% and 1.0%; Stringency (pre 1981 only) = 27.0%. 2) OBDII test for 1996 and newer vehicles. Waiver Rates = 0.0% and 1.0%. Compliance rate for both programs = 98.0%.	Same	Data acquired from/confirmed by Denis Turner, Air Quality Board, on 3-1-2007.
Anti-Tamper Program	Annual check for gasoline vehicles. Model years 1981 and newer are checked for tampering with: air pump, catalyst, fuel inlet restrictor, EGR, and the gas cap. Compliance rate is 98.0%.	Same	Data acquired from/confirmed by Denis Turner, Air Quality Board, on 3-1-2007.
Min/Max Temperature	Winter = 28.95 / 47.46 F Summer = 49.29 / 78.18 F	Same	Although these temperatures are different from the ones used in the PM ₁₀ Maintenance Plan, they have been used for conformity since at least 2004. ITD's PLAQ uses different temperatures for project screening purposes.
Fuel Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP)	Winter = 15.0 Summer = 8.6	Same	
Diesel Fuel Sulfur Content	500 ppm until 2010 15 ppm after 2010	Same	Diesel fuel sulfur content will be reduced to 15 ppm by 2010 as per federal fuel standards.
Facility Speeds	Based on the weighted average model speeds for interstates, interstate ramps, principle arterials, minor arterials, collectors, local roads, and centroid connectors.	Same	Per PM ₁₀ Maintenance Plan Methodology (see Attachment 2).

Fuel Program	3 = Conventional Gasoline West	Same	Applies one of two phase-in schedules for the Tier 2 sulfur fuel standards for years after 1999.
Absolute Humidity	Winter = 24.87% Summer = 43.05%	Same	Although these values are different from the ones used in the PM ₁₀ Maintenance Plan, they have been used for conformity since at least 2004.
Seasonal Evaluation	Average of winter and summer emissions factors	Same	Winter emissions will be for years 2010, 2011, 2014, 2016, 2026, and 2031. This will allow us to take credit for some fleet turnover in November and December.

Attachment 2: Summary of COMPASS' Proposed Regional Emissions Analysis Methodologies

Budget Tests: A Budget Test will be used to demonstrate conformity of the FY2009-2013 TIP for NO_x , VOC, and PM_{10} . The test will use the PM_{10} Maintenance Plan's annual emissions estimation methodology. This method developed an annual average emissions factor by averaging summer and winter emissions factors for each pollutant. These annual average emissions factors will then be used with forecasted VMT from the travel demand model to calculate annual average emissions in tons per day (TPD).

VOC Emissions Adjustment: Refueling emissions will not be included in the VOC analyses. The supporting on-road emissions inventory calculations for the PM_{10} Maintenance Plan removed more than refueling emissions from VOC estimates. However, this was done inconsistently and COMPASS staff has been unable to determine exactly how VOC emissions were calculated. Therefore, all evaporative VOC emissions, excluding refueling emissions, will be included in the VOC emissions estimates. This will be done by calculating the seasonal VOC emissions factors using MOBILE6.2 and the following equation:

$$EF_{\text{adj}} = \sum_{x=1}^{27} \{ (EF_x - RE_x) * F_x \}$$

Where:

EF_{adj} = Adjusted VOC emissions factor (in grams VOC/mile) for a given roadway type
 x = MOBILE6.2 vehicle classification (27 classifications based on gross vehicle weight and fuel type)

EF_x = Total VOC emission factor (tailpipe + evaporative, in grams VOC/mile) for a specific vehicle class on a given roadway type

RE_x = Refueling VOC emissions factor for a specific vehicle class (in grams VOC/mile)

F_x = Fraction of vehicle class x in total fleet

The adjusted emissions factors were then used to produce the VOC emissions estimates.

PM Emissions: PM_{10} emissions will be calculated using average weekday VMT, not average daily VMT, per the Northern Ada County PM_{10} Maintenance Plan.

CO Planning Analysis: A Build/No Build Test will be conducted using winter emissions factors for CO instead of annual average. Average daily VMT will be used to calculate CO emissions. In addition, CO emissions estimates will be compared to those in the CO Limited Maintenance Plan emissions inventory and the PM_{10} Maintenance Plan. A CO planning analysis is not required by FHWA, but is a requirement of the CO Limited Maintenance Plan.

Methodology for Determining MOBILE Model Facility Speeds: First, speeds for each link in the travel demand model are VMT weighted by multiplying the congested speed of the link by its corresponding distance and daily volume:

$$SW_l = S_l * VMT_l$$

Where:

SW_l = VMT weights containing speed for each link (miles²/hour)

S_l = Congested speed of the link (miles/hour)

VMT_l = Weekday VMT for the link (miles)

The daily VMT and the VMT weights containing speed are then summed for each of the 7 modeled facility types:

$$SW_t = \sum_1^n SW_l \quad VMT_t = \sum_1^n VMT_l$$

Where:

SW_t = Total VMT weights containing speed for a given facility type (miles²/ hour)

VMT_t = Total weekday VMT of a given facility type (miles)

n = number of links for a given facility type

To arrive at a final speed for each travel demand model facility, the total VMT weight containing speed for each facility type is divided by the total VMT of a given facility type:

$$S_m = \frac{SW_t}{VMT_t}$$

Where:

S_m = Speed used in MOBLIE6.2 for a given facility type (miles/hour)

This was the methodology used to develop the on-road portion of the PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan's emission inventory and motor vehicle emissions budgets.

MOBILE6.2 Modeling of Facility Types:

Travel Demand Model Interstate = MOBILE6.2 Freeways

Travel Demand Model Principal Arterials = MOBILE6.2 Arterial

Travel Demand Model Minor Arterials = MOBILE6.2 Arterial

Travel Demand Model Collectors = MOBILE6.2 Arterial

Travel Demand Model Local Roads: For local facility types MOBILE6.2 assigns a speed of 12.9 mph. However travel demand model speeds of local roads are well above 12.9 mph. Therefore emissions factors for local roads are calculated using the ratios of three MOBILE6.2 generated emissions factors:

$$EF_{local} = EF_{as} \times \frac{EF_l}{EF_{al}}$$

Where:

EF_{local} = Emissions factor for local roads (grams/mile)

EF_{as} = The MOBILE6.2 emissions factor for local roads modeled as an arterial (grams/mile)

EF_l = The MOBILE6.2 emissions factor for local roads modeled as a local road (grams/mile)

EF_{al} = The MOBILE6.2 emissions factor for local roads modeled as an arterial at a speed of 12.9 mph (grams/mile)

Travel Demand Model Ramps: For freeway ramps, MOBILE6.2 assigns a speed of 34.6 mph. This was accepted and used for the PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan's emissions inventory.

Travel Demand Model Centroid Connectors = MOBILE6.2 Arterial. Centroid connectors are more representative of a MOBILE6.2 local roadway than a MOBILE6.2 arterial. The travel demand model speeds of most centroid connectors are 15 mph, while the speeds of local roadways are closer to those found on minor arterials and collectors. However, an analysis conducted as part of the FY2004-2008 Northern Ada County TIP regional emissions analysis showed that changing this emissions estimation methodology was insignificant.

Canyon County Vehicles on Ada County Roads

Separate emissions factors will be developed to account for the Canyon County resident portion of Ada County VMT. Estimates of the Canyon portion of Ada VMT are based on COMPASS' 2002 Household Travel Survey and US Census statistics. The only difference between the Canyon and

Ada County emissions factors will be the impacts associated with the I/M program. Below is an example of how Canyon County vehicles driven on Ada County roadways were accounted for in the FY2007-2011 regional emissions analysis.

Percentage of Ada VMT traveled by Canyon County Vehicles in 2007:

- 32.00% Canyon Pop. That work in Ada (Table 28 of the *2002 Treasure Valley Transportation Survey*)
- 33.70% Going Home trips (Table 35 of the *2002 Treasure Valley Transportation Survey*)
- 8.30% Work Trips (Table 35 of the *2002 Treasure Valley Transportation Survey*)
- 5.40% Work Related Trips (Table 35 of the *2002 Treasure Valley Transportation Survey*)

- 47.40% Sum of all Canyon work related trips

Therefore:

32.00% Canyon Commuting Pop. x 47.40% of Canyon Trips related to work =
 15.17% Canyon Trips that involve Ada travel, based on work trips

2007	Average Daily Canyon VMT (From COMPASS' TDM)	15.17% x 3,506,042 VMT = 531,797	Estimated Canyon VMT that includes Ada travel, based on work trips
Interstate	905,610	531,797 VMT ÷ 7,317,523 Ada VMT = .0727	.0727 x 100 =
Principal Art.	1,226,949		
Minor Art.	760,969		
Collectors	285,217		
Locals	13,040		
Ramps	38,289		
Centroids	275,967		
Total	3,506,042		7.27 % Of Ada's 2007 VMT from Canyon Commuters

Once the percentage of Canyon vehicle travel on the Ada network is calculated for each analysis year, emissions are estimated using the Ada VMT and network speeds for a 100% Ada fleet and a 100% Canyon fleet. The total emissions for a given analysis are the sum of the portion of Canyon fleet emissions in Ada and the portion of Ada fleet emissions:

$$E_t = E_c(VMT_f) + (E_a(1-VMT_f))$$

Where:

E_t = Total Ada County Emissions (tons/day)

E_c = Emissions resulting from a 100% Canyon County Fleet on Ada's Network (tons/day)

E_a = Emissions resulting from a 100% Ada County Fleet on Ada's Network (tons/day)

VMT_f = Fraction Ada VMT traveled by Canyon County vehicles (percentage derived above ÷

100)

Road Dust Emissions

In February of 2002, Desert Research Institute (DRI) completed a study of fugitive road dust emissions from paved and unpaved roadways in Ada and Canyon Counties (*Treasure Valley Road Dust Study: Final Report*, Etyemezian et. all, DRI; February 15, 2002). It was included in Appendix F of the PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan and used to establish the PM₁₀ motor vehicle emissions budget for Ada County. Section 5 of the report yielded a more current and area specific emissions estimation methodology. It estimates emissions using roadway speeds and an empirically derived emissions potentials.

Unpaved Roads:

$$b = C_{C,S,T} \times s^{-x}$$

Where:

b = Roadway emissions potential (grams PM₁₀/VKT/mps)

C_{C,S,T} = Constant assumed to be 8.58 grams PM₁₀/VKT/mps for dry unpaved roads in Ada County (Section 5.2 of the *Treasure Valley Road Dust Study: Final Report*)

s^{-x} = Dry emissions multiplier used to account for snow cover and precipitation on unpaved roads in Ada County (Table 5-11 of the *Treasure Valley Road Dust Study: Final Report*)

Because unpaved roads are not included in COMPASS' model networks, the *Treasure Valley Road Dust Study: Final Report* assumed unpaved roadway speeds to be 25 miles per hour (11.2 mps). The result is a constant emissions factor of 0.31 pounds road dust per mile traveled for unpaved roadways. Average daily trips on unpaved roadways in Ada County can be assumed, as in past regional emissions analyses, to be 120 vehicles per day. Paving is assumed to occur in Ada County at a rate of 1.95% a year, based on data from ACHD.

Using Table 5-11 of the *Treasure Valley Road Dust Study: Final Report* yields a winter dry emissions multiplier (s^{-x}) of 0.77 and a summer value equal to 0.90. In the past it appears that incorrect winter and summer multipliers of 0.91 and 0.94 were used in this calculation. These values result if paved road emissions multipliers from Table 5-4 are mistakenly used.

Paved Roads:

$$b = C_{C,S,T} \times s^{-x}$$

Where:

b = Roadway emissions potential (grams PM₁₀/VKT/mps)

C_{C,S,T} = Constant dependant on County, setting, and season (grams PM₁₀/VKT/mps)

S = Posted speed of the roadway (mps)

x = Empirically derived exponent dependant on County, setting, and season (1/mps)

Table 5-1 in the Treasure Valley Road Dust Study contains values used in the equation above. DRI found C_{C,S,T} for paved residential/local roadways to be independent of speed (x = 0). However, paved residential roadway emissions potentials were still seasonally dependant.

In order to calculate road dust emissions, emissions factors were calculated for Ada County's paved urban rural roadways during both summer and winter seasons:

$$EF_{S,T} = b_{S,T} \times s$$

Where:

EF_{S,T} = Roadway PM₁₀ emissions factor per setting and season (grams PM₁₀/VKT)

$b_{s,T}$ = Roadway emissions potential per setting and season (grams PM₁₀/VKT/mps)
S = Posted speed of the roadway (mps)

Individual link speeds and DRI's urban/rural setting designations were used to calculate paved road emissions factors for each roadway link in COMPASS' travel demand model network. Posted speed, in miles per hour (mph), are converted to meters per second (mps) using a conversion factor of 0.447.

Because paved road dust emissions factors change with the seasons, two emissions factors were calculated for each link: a winter factor and a summer factor. Each of these seasonal emissions factors was then adjusted to account for precipitation effects (7% reduction in the summer and 9% reduction in the winter). The seasonal emissions factors adjusted for precipitation effects were then combined, using 0.25 as the fraction of the year the winter scenario applies and 0.75 as the fraction of the year that is summer. This results in one composite emissions factor per roadway link.

PM₁₀ emissions for each link were then calculated by applying the emissions factor to average weekday vehicle kilometers traveled (VKT) of the link:

$$E_{PM10,L} = EF_{C,L} \times VKT_L$$

Where:

$E_{PM10,L}$ = PM₁₀ emissions for a given link (grams PM₁₀/day)

$EF_{C,L}$ = Composite PM₁₀ emissions factor for a given link (grams PM₁₀/VKT)

VKT_L = Average weekday vehicle kilometers traveled for the link (VKT)

Conversion factors of 1.6 kilometers/mile and 907,184.74 grams/ton were applied to get a result in ton PM₁₀/day.

Attachment 3: COMPASS Travel Demand Model Assumptions

- Model Development - COMPASS' two-county travel demand model was completed and approved in June 2004 by the Transportation Model Advisory Committee. The model's demographic and land use "base year" is 2002 to coincide with COMPASS' most recent household travel survey. To develop the 2002 demographics, 2000 Census block-level data was allocated to TAZs then, building permit data from 2000 and 2002 to estimate the base year population and households. Detailed employment data was purchased, cleaned and allocated to TAZs for the base year model. As part of the model development, staff collected roadway information such as speed, number of lanes, and connectivity. In addition, staff reviewed planning level capacities in the model.
- 2002 Treasure Valley Household Characteristics Study - COMPASS surveyed Treasure Valley residents' travel habits in fall of 2002. This survey was part of a major effort to update the input data for the model. Detailed travel data was collected from 2,582 households for each person in the household. The data provide from the survey were used by staff to calculate trip rates by trip type by household classification for both counties, auto occupancy factors by trip type, and the number of trips per duration of time.
- Demographics – *Communities in Motion (CIM)*, COMPASS' long range regional transportation plan contains a "Community Choices" demographic/growth scenario and supporting transportation system for 2030. This plan was adopted by the COMPASS Board in August 2006. The "Community Choices" growth/land use scenario combines modest land use intensification/densification along transportation corridors with additional employment and population growth in outlying communities. Less suburban residential development is anticipated in this growth scenario, as compared with the current trend. With more infill development (and thus increased densities) within areas of impact and along primary corridors, this scenario consumes less land.
- Mode Choice Tool – "Mode Choice" is the third step in a traditional 4-step travel demand model, such as the one maintained by COMPASS. It takes person trips estimated using the demographic input data and splits them into mode specific trips. In June of 2005 a mode choice tool for the COMPASS travel demand model was completed. It is based on the mode choice tool utilized by the Salt Lake City regional MPO (Wasatch Front Regional Council). The tool sorts trips into one of either two motorized (bus or auto) or two non-motorized (walk or bike) mode choices. Transit (bus) trips are assigned to the transit network, while vehicle trips are assigned to the roadway network.
- Validation – As per federal guidance, the model has been validated to actual traffic count data. The guidance suggests a model is validated when predicted volumes are within a certain percentage of the measured volumes on a given facility type. Federal validation guidelines:

Freeways/Interstates:	Less than 7% deviation
Principal Arterials:	Less than 10% deviation
Minor Arterials:	Less than 15% deviation
Collectors:	Less than 25% deviation

Additionally, staff validated the model to California Transportation Department (CALTrans) standards. The model was also put through a sensitivity analysis. This involves testing the model's response to changes made to its inputs. The results were then analyzed for their reasonableness.



MEMORANDUM

To: Interagency Consultation Committee
FROM: MaryAnn Waldinger, Principal Planner
DATE: May 21, 2009
RE: Review FY2010-2014 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Emissions Analysis-Draft Project List

ACTION REQUESTED:

None. Information Only.

BACKGROUND:

The ICC is required to review and approve the assumptions and emissions estimation methodologies used in regional emissions analyses. These analyses are conducted for transportation conformity purposes per 40CFR93 and IDAPA 58.01.01.563. Any Northern Ada County Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) or long-range transportation plan must demonstrate conformity to the motor vehicle emissions budgets established by the Northern Ada County PM₁₀ Maintenance Plan. Budgets are established for particular matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). A regional emissions analysis is not federally required for carbon monoxide (CO). However, Northern Ada County's Limited Maintenance Plan for CO requires COMPASS to conduct a build/no build emissions analysis for local planning purposes.

STATUS:

Staff has prepared the attached listing of projects proposed to make up the "build" travel demand model networks for use in the FY2010-2014 Regional TIP Emissions Analysis and subsequent conformity demonstration for Northern Ada County. The model networks include projects proposed as part of the Ada County Highway District's (ACHD) Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) draft as of May 1, 2009, Five-Year Work Program (FYWP) draft May 14, 2009, and *Communities in Motion* (CIM) adopted on August 21, 2006.

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) will submit their formal FY2010-2014 project list to COMPASS for inclusion in the FY2010-2014 Regional TIP in late May 2009. GARVEE projects for the Treasure Valley are included in COMPASS' current *Communities in Motion*: Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan 2030 and model assumptions.

Staff requests the ICC's review of the two attachments and formulate any questions or comments regarding the proposed model networks (Attachment 1) or federal regulations regarding financially constrained plans. Attachment 1 includes an additional table listing those roadway projects that will be removed from the model network for conformity purposes (per Title 23 – see Attachment 2). These projects are listed as illustrative in CIM or for right-of-way preservation only in ACHD's CIP therefore, not part of the funded project list. The ICC will be asked to take action on the proposed model networks at a June 2009 meeting.

Attachments (2)
pc: 685.1

MW:dw T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Packets\June42009\draft project memo list.docx

**DRAFT FY 2010-2014 Regional Emissions Analysis Model Networks
As of May 20, 2009**

The following table lists the 2009 projects recently completed (open to the public) or under construction but expected to be open to the motoring public by December 31, 2009.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
1.	Deer Flat Rd	Ten Mile Rd - SH 69	3	FYWP/CIP	RD125	No	No	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	Begin summer 09
2.	Floating Feather Rd	Eagle Rd - Edgewood Dr	3	FYWP	RD257	No	No	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	Done
3.	Maple Grove Rd	Franklin Rd - Fairview Ave	5	FYWP/TIP/STIP	F040/7192	No	Yes	No	Done
4.	Meridian Rd & Main St (Ph 1 of split corridor)	I-84 - Franklin Rd	3	FYWP/CIP/CIM/TIP/STIP	RD205-06	Yes*	No	No	Under construction
5.	ParkCenter East Bridge	ParkCenter Blvd - Warm Springs Ave	4	FYWP/CIP/TIP/STIP	MA203-02	Yes - Principal Arterial	No	No	Under construction
6.	Pine St - new	Locust Grove Rd - Eagle Rd (Developer Funded)	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	Done
7.	Ustick Rd	Five Mile Rd - Cole Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RD222	No	No	No	Done

2010 Network

The base network uses 2010 demographics and consists of the existing roadway network and the projects assumed to be completed and open to the motoring public by December 31, 2010. The 2010 demographics forecasts were developed using the Community Choices allocation. The 2010 network uses 2010 Community Choices demographics and includes all the projects listed above along with the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
8.	I-84	Garrity IC - Meridian IC	6	TIP/STIP/CIM	9815	Yes - Interstate	Yes - GARVEE	No	Under construction	2010
9.	Orchard IC	Reconstruct - add new ramps and lanes	NA	TIP/CIM/STIP	9817	Yes - Interstate	Yes - GARVEE	Yes - (40CFR9 3.127)	2009/Funded/2009	UC – 4/2010
10.	Ten Mile Rd	Franklin Rd - Cherry Ln	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RD309	No	No	No	2010/2007/Funded	2010
11.	Vista IC	Reconstruct - add new ramps and lanes	NA	TIP/STIP/CIM	9818	Yes - Interstate	Yes - GARVEE	Yes - (40CFR9 3.127)	2011/2011/Funded	9/2010

2014 Network

The 2014 network uses 2014 Community Choices demographics and includes the construction year networks for 2010, along with the following list of projects. The 2014 demographics were estimated using a straight-line interpolation between 2010 demographics and 2015 Community Choices demographics.

No	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
12.	30 th St (new road)	Fairview Ave - State St	5	FYWP/CIP	RD202-09	No	No	No	PD/2010	2014/2014-2018
13.	Adams St	Improved connection 36 th to 37 th St (Clay St)	3	FYWP	RD101	No	No	Yes	PD	2014
14.	Eagle Rd	Victory Rd - Ridenbaugh Canal	5	FYWP/CIP/TIP/STIP	RD203-07	Yes - Principal Arterial	No	No	2010/2007/2007/ 2007	2011
15.	Franklin Rd	Eagle Rd - Five Mile Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/TIP	RD282/8698	Yes - Principal Arterial	Yes	No	2010/2009/2009/2010	2011
16.	Franklin Rd	Ten Mile Rd - Linder Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/TIP/CIM	RC0165/9504	Yes*	Yes	No	PD/2011/2011/ PD/Funded	2012/2014-2018**
17.	Five Mile Rd	Franklin Rd - Fairview Ave	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/TIP	F038/7238	No	Yes	No	2013/2009/2013/ 2011	2013
18.	Hill Rd Extension	State St - Horseshoe Bend Rd	3	FYWP	RD308	No	No	No	2012	2012
19.	I-84	Garrity IC - Meridian IC	8	STIP/CIM		Yes - Interstate	Yes - GARVEE	No	Funded	UC - Add'l lanes open after structure work complete
20.	I-84	Cole / Overland IC - Broadway IC	8	STIP/CIM		Yes - Interstate	Yes - GARVEE	No	Funded	UC - 6/2011
21.	Overland Rd	Ten Mile Rd - Linder Rd	5	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2013-2017	2011/2014-2018**
22.	Meridian Rd & Main St (Ph 2 of split corridor)	Franklin - Fairview Ave	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM/TIP/STIP	RD205-07	Yes*	TBD	No	2012/2013-2017/ Funded/PD/2012	2013
23.	SH 16 River Crossing	Connect SH 16 from SH 44 to US 20/26	4	CIM		Yes - Principal Arterial	Yes - GARVEE	No	2011/2011Funded	2012

2014 Network

24.	Ten Mile Rd IC	New Interchange at I-84 and Ten Mile Rd between Overland Rd – Franklin Rd	NA	TIP/STIP	9815	Yes - Interstate	Yes - GARVEE	No	2009/2009	2014
25.	Ten Mile Rd	Cherry Ln - Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RD188	No	No	No	2013/2009/Funded	2014

2015 Network

The 2015 network uses 2015 Community Choices demographics and includes the construction year networks for 2009, 2010, 2013, along with the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
26.	Cloverdale Rd	Lake Hazel Rd - Overland Rd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	2014-2018
27.	Cloverdale Rd	Franklin Rd - Fairview Ave	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RD202-14	No	No	No	UF/2010/Funded	PD/2014-2018
28.	Cloverdale Rd	Fairview Ave - Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RC0087	No	No	No	PD/2011/Funded	UF/2014-2018
29.	Cloverdale Rd	Ustick Rd – US 20/26	5	CIP/CIM	RD207-13 & RC 0092	No	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	UF/2014-2018
30.	Eagle Rd	Amity Rd - Victory Rd	5	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR9 3.126)	2018-2027	2014 - 2018
31.	Cole Rd	I-84 WB ramps - Franklin Rd	5	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2013-2017	2014-2018
32.	Fairview Ave	Eagle Rd - Cloverdale Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/CIM/TIP/STIP	RC0130	Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2013/2018-2027/ Funded/PD/PD	UF/2014-2018
33.	Fairview Ave	Locust Grove – Eagle Rd (SH55)	7	FYWP/CIP/CIM/TIP/STIP	RC0133	Yes – Principle Arterial	TBD	No	PD/2018-2027/ Funded/PD/PD	UF/2014-2018
34.	Five Mile Rd	Amity Rd - Victory Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2018-2027	2014-2018
35.	Lake Hazel Rd	Eagle Rd - Cole Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	2014-2018
36.	Lake Hazel Rd Extension	Cole Rd - Pleasant Valley Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	2014-2018
37.	Maple Grove Rd	Victory Rd – Overland Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR9 3.126)	2013-2017	2014-2018
38.	Orchard St	Gowen Rd - I-84 EB on ramp	5	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2013-2017	2014-2018
39.	Ustick Rd	Cloverdale Rd - Five Mile Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RD220	No	No	No	UF/2013-2017/ Funded	PD/2014-2018

2015 Network

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
40.	Ustick Rd	Meridian Rd - Eagle Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RD202-37	Yes*	TBD	No	UF/2013-2017/ Funded	2014 – 2018
41.	Ustick Rd	Eagle Rd - Cloverdale Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/CIM	RD205-04	No	TBD	No	UF/2013-2017/ Funded	2014 - 2018
42.	State St	Glenwood St – Collister Dr	7	CIP		Yes - Principal	TBD	No	2018-2027	2014-2018
43.	Ustick Rd	Black Cat Rd – Ten Mile Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/ Funded	2014 - 2018

2025 Network

The 2025 network uses 2025 Community Choices demographics and includes the construction year networks for 2010, 2013, 2015, along with the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
44.	36th St	Extend 36 th St from existing to Cartwright Rd and Bogus Basin Rd	3	CIP		No	No	No	2018-2027	UF 2019-2027
45.	Cloverdale Rd	Columbia Rd – Lake Hazel Rd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	UF ROW only
46.	Cloverdale Rd	Overland Rd - Franklin Rd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	UF-Row only
47.	Cole Rd	Lake Hazel Rd - Victory Rd	5	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2013-2017	2019-2027
48.	Fairview Ave	Cloverdale Rd - Five Mile Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/CIM/TIP/STIP	RC0127	Yes - Principal Arterial	No	No	2012/2011/Funded/2011/PD	UF/2019-2027
49.	Fairview Ave	Five Mile Rd - Maple Grove Rd	7	FYWP/CIP/TIP/CIM/STIP	RC0131	Yes - Principal Arterial	No	No	2012/2011/2011/Funded/2011	UF/2019-2027
50.	Fairview Ave	Maple Grove Rd - Cole Rd	7	CIP/CIM		Yes – Principal Arterial	No	No		UF/2019-2027
51.	Maple Grove Rd	Lake Hazel – Victory Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	2013-2017	2019-2027
52.	Linder Rd	Ustick Rd to Chinden Blvd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	2013-2017/UF	2019-2027
53.	McMillan Rd	Locust Grove Rd - Eagle Rd	5	FYWP/CIP	RC0240	No	TBD	No	UF/2013-2017	UF/2019-2027
54.	Meridian Rd IC	Improvement: cloverleaf ramp for WB I-84 - SB SH 69 (Kuna-Meridian Rd)	NA	CIM		Yes - Interstate	Yes	Yes - Safety (40CFR 93.126)	Funded	

2025 Network

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
55.	SH 16 Expressway	Ada Co. Line - I-84 (Urban ICs at Chaparral, Beacon Light, SH 44, US 20/26, and Ustick)	4	CIM		Yes - Principal Arterial	Yes	No	Funded	
56.	SH 16 IC	I-84 - Vicinity of McDermott		CIM		Yes - Interstate	Yes	No	Funded	
57.	Pine St	Eagle Rd - Colverdale Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2013-2017	2019-2027
58.	Ten Mile Rd	Victory Rd – Amity Rd	5	CIP/CIM	RC0299	Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	UF – ROW only
59.	Ten Mile Rd	Ustick Rd - Chinden Blvd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	UF – ROW only
60.	Ten Mile Rd	Amity Rd - Overland Rd	5	CIP/CIM	RC0299	Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	2019-2027
61.	Ustick Rd	Cole Rd - Curtis Rd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	2013-2017/Funded	2019-2027

2030 Network

The 2030 network uses 2030 Community Choices demographics and includes the construction year networks for 2010, 2014, 2015, 2025, along with the following list of projects.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
62.	36 th St	Hill Rd - Cartwright Rd	3	FYWP/CIP	RD307	No	No	Yes - Safety (40CFR 93.126)	UF/2008	UF/2019-2027
63.	Amity Rd	McDermott Rd - Meridian Rd	3	CIP/(5 lanes in CIM)		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	UF- ROW only
64.	Amity Rd	Meridian Rd - Eagle Rd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	2019-2027
65.	Amity Rd	Federal Way - Holcomb Rd	5	CIP	RD209-01	No	No	No	2018-2027	Ask ACHD
66.	Avalon Rd (Kuna Rd)	Linder Rd - Orchard St	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2018-2027	2019-2027
67.	Broadway IC	Reconstruct - add new ramps and lanes	N.A.	CIM	9821	Yes - Interstate	Yes	Yes - (40CFR 93.127)	Funded	
68.	Cherry Ln	McDermott Rd - Black Cat Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	UF- ROW only
69.	Emerald St	Cole Rd -Orchard St	5	CIP		Yes - +45K ADT	TBD	No	2018-2027	2019-2027
70.	Federal Way	S/o SH 21 - Isaac Canyon IC	5	Developer Funded		No	Developer Funded	No	NA	
71.	Franklin Rd	McDermott Rd - Black Cat Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	UF-ROW only
72.	Gowen IC	Reconstruct	NA	CIM	9822	Yes - Interstate	Yes	Yes - (40CFR 93.127)	Funded	
73.	I-84	Broadway IC - Isaacs Canyon IC	8	CIM	K307/ K301	Yes - Interstate	Yes	No	Funded	
74.	Lake Hazel Rd	McDermott Rd - SH 69	5	CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	Funded	
75.	Lake Hazel Rd	SH 69 – Eagle Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	UF – ROW only CIP-3 lanes
76.	Lake Hazel Rd (Gowen Rd Realignment)	Gowen Rd - Eisenman Rd	4-5	CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	Funded	

2030 Network

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Construction Year – FY0913	Status
77.	Meridian Rd	Cherry Ln - Chinden Blvd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2018-2027	UF – ROW only
78.	Overland Rd New Extension	Black Cat Rd – Ten Mile Rd	5	South Meridian Study		No	TBD	No	2030 – Overland Rd east of Ten Mile Rd will be realigned due to the Ten Mile IC.	
79.	Overland Rd	Vista Ave - Federal Way	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR 93.126)	2018-2027	2014-2018
80.	SH 44	Ada Co. Line - Ballantyne Rd	4	CIM		Yes - Principal Arterial	Yes	No	Funded	
81.	State St	Collister Dr – 36 th - 27 th St	7	CIP		Yes - Principal	TBD	No	2018-2027	2019-2027
82.	Ten Mile Rd	Lake Hazel - Victory Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	2019-2027
83.	Three City's River Crossing (new road & bridge)	Chinden Blvd - State St	5	FYWP/CIP/STIP/CIM	C202-01/9189	Yes - Principal Arterial	Yes	No	UF/2018-2027/PD/Funded	2019-2027
84.	US 20/26	Can Ada Rd - Eagle Rd	4	CIM		Yes - Principal Arterial	Yes	No	Funded	
85.	Ustick Rd	Star Rd – Black Cat Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	UF – ROW only
86.	Ustick Rd	Ten Mile Rd – Meridian Rd	5	CIP/CIM		Yes*	TBD	No	2018-2027/Funded	2019 - 2027
87.	Victory Rd	Maple Grove Rd - Cole Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	2018-2027	2014 - 2018
88.	Eagle Rd	I-84 - ½ mile north of Fairview	7	City of Meridian/CIM/TIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	No	No	2013/2008	Tentatively move to 2030 – seeking guidance

Illustrative and/or ROW only: The following projects will be removed from the model networks for air quality conformity purposes.

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
89.	Beacon Light Rd	Extend Beacon Light Rd from Ada Co. Line - SH 16	2	CIM		No	TBD	No	Illustrative
90.	Beacon Light Rd	SH 16 - Park Ln	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	UF- ROW only
91.	Beacon Light Rd	Park Ln - Eagle Rd	3	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	UF- ROW only
92.	Black Cat Rd	Amity Rd - Cherry Ln	3	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF-ROW only
93.	Black Cat Rd	Cherry Ln - Chinden Blvd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	UF-ROW only
94.	Cherry Ln	Linder Rd - Meridian Rd	7	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	UF- ROW only
95.	Eagle Rd	Lake Hazel Rd – Amity Rd	5	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF- ROW only
96.	Emerald St	Five Mile Rd – Cole Rd Orchard St	5	CIP		Yes - +45K ADT	TBD	No	UF- ROW only
97.	Executive St / Presidential	Cloverdale Rd - Five Mile Rd (3 In couplet with Presidential)	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF- ROW only
98.	Fairview Ave	Main St - Locust Grove	7	FYWP/CIP/CIM/TIP/STIP	RC0135	Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
99.	Fairview Ave	Cole Rd - Orchard St (or e/o Curtis Rd)	7	CIP/CIM		Yes – Principal Arterial	No	No	UF - ROW only
100.	Five Mile Rd	Lake Hazel Rd – Amity Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
101.	Five Mile Rd	Overland Rd - Franklin Rd	5	CIP		No*	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
102.	Five Mile Rd	Fairview Ave - Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP	RD195A	No	No	No	UF – ROW only
103.	Five Mile Rd	Ustick Rd - McMillan Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
104.	Franklin Rd	Eagle Rd - Milwaukee St	7	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
105.	Glenwood St / Cole Rd couplet	Two way couplet - Mountain View Dr	3	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
106.	Hill Rd	Castle Dr - 36 th St	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only
107.	Linder Rd	Victory Rd - Overland Rd	5	CIM		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	illustrative
108.	Linder Rd	Kuna Mora Rd - Victory Rd	5	CIM		No	TBD	No	illustrative
109.	Linder Rd	Overland Rd - Franklin Rd (includes overpass)	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	UF ROW only
110.	Linder Rd	Franklin Rd - Ustick Rd	5	FYWP/CIP/ CIM	RD077	No	No	No	2019-2027
111.	Linder Rd	Chinden Blvd - State St (4 lane bridge)	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
112.	Linder Rd	State St - Beacon Light Rd	5	CIP/CIM		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
113.	Locust Grove Rd	Fairview Ave - McMillan Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
114.	Maple Grove Rd	Fairview Ave - McMillan Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
115.	McDermott Rd	Lake Hazel Rd - I84	5	CIM		Yes* - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	illustrative
116.	McMillan Rd	McDermott Rd - Locust Grove Rd	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only
117.	McMillan Rd	Cloverdale Rd - Five Mile Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
118.	McMillan Rd	Five Mile Rd - Maple Grove Rd	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only
119.	Overland Rd	Meridian Rd - Maple Grove Rd	7	CIP		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	UF – ROW only

No.	Project	Location	No. of lanes	Source	FYWP #/ITD Key #	Regionally Significant	Federal Aid	Exempt	Status
120.	SH 55	Beacon Light Rd - Brookside Ln	4	CIM		Yes - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	illustrative
121.	SH 69 Connection	Kuna Mora Rd - Kuna Rd	2	CIM		Yes* - Principal Arterial	TBD	No	illustrative
122.	State St	36 th - 27 th St	7	CIP		Yes - Principal	TBD	No	UF – ROW only
123.	Victory Rd	Eagle Rd - Cloverdale Rd	3	CIP		No	TBD	Yes - Safety (40CFR93.126)	UF – ROW only
124.	Victory Rd	Cloverdale Rd – Maple Grove Rd	5	CIP		No	TBD	No	UF – ROW only

Source of Projects:

FYWP = Ada County Highway District's Five Year Work Plan FY 2009-2013

CIP = ACHD 2006 Capital Improvements Plan FY 2006-2027

STIP = Idaho Transportation Department's Statewide Transportation Improvement Program FY 2008-2012 and Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) Bond Scenario 7 approved by the IT Board in October 2006

TIP = Draft FY 2009-2013 Regional Transportation Improvement Program list

CIM = *Communities in Motion Amendment* Project List – Long Range Transportation Plan for the six county region

ILL = Illustrative in *Communities in Motion Amendment* Project List

FYWP #/ITD Key #:

FYWP# = ACHD GIS Numbers are alpha numeric identification numbers (ex. RD169)

ITD Key# = ITD Key Numbers are from the Transportation Improvement Program and the State Transportation Improvement Program and are strictly numeric (ex. 6299)

Regionally Significant:

Yes* = Represents a proposed change in functional classification as part of *Communities in Motion*

Regionally Significant Roadway Project Definition:

Regional emissions analyses, for the purposes of demonstrating transportation conformity of a TIP or long-range plan, must include all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects in the nonattainment or maintenance area. On January 30, 2002, the ICC developed the following definition of a "Regionally Significant" project:

"A transportation project in Ada County, Idaho is designated 'Regionally Significant' if:

- (a) the project is for the improvement of either:
 - (i) a principal arterial or higher functional classification; or
 - (ii) a minor arterial which will have a twenty (20) year projected traffic volume of at least 45,000 vehicles a day after completion of the project; and

- (b) the project will add at least one new continuous vehicular lane which either:
 - (i) extends from one intersecting principal or minor arterial to another intersecting principal or minor arterial; or
 - (ii) in the case of an interstate, extends from the on ramp of one interstate interchange to a point beyond the off ramp of the next adjacent interstate interchange."

Despite these definitions, the ICC maintains discretionary authority in interpreting and applying them to the area's transportation programs, plans, and projects. For the purposes of this conformity determination, all applicable roadway projects, despite their significance, were included in the travel demand model networks.

Exempt:

Pursuant to 40CFR93.126 (Exempt Projects), certain projects listed in a long-range transportation plan or TIP may proceed even in the absence of a conformity finding/demonstration. Exempt projects include highway safety or mass transit projects, landscaping projects, roadway rehabilitation and repair, transportation enhancement projects, and transportation planning activities that do not lead directly to construction. However, the exempt projects listed in 40CFR93.126 are not considered exempt if the ICC concludes that they may have an adverse impact on air quality.

Federal Aid:

GARVEE = Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) bonds are tax-exempt financing mechanisms backed by annual federal appropriations for

federal-aid transportation projects.

Construction Year:

UF = Construction is unfunded, illustrative, design and/or right-of-way in FYWP

PD = Preliminary development projects

UC = Under Construction

Status:

Based on monthly GARVEE reports provided by ITD, ACHD's draft FYWP 2010-2014 and draft CIP.

The COMPASS model is a two-county model. The planned projects in Ada and Canyon County are included in the appropriate model network year.

T:\FY09\600 Projects\685 TIP\10-14 TIP\AQ Conformity FY1014\1014TIP_draftI_projectlistmw.docx

Title 23: Highways**§ 450.104 Definitions.**

Amendment means a revision to a long-range statewide or metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP that involves a major change to a project included in a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP, including the addition or deletion of a project or a major change in project cost, project/project phase initiation dates, or a major change in design concept or design scope (e.g., changing project termini or the number of through traffic lanes). Changes to projects that are included only for **illustrative** purposes do not require an amendment. An amendment is a revision that requires public review and comment, redemonstration of fiscal constraint, or a conformity determination (for metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs involving “non-exempt” projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas). In the context of a long-range statewide transportation plan, an amendment is a revision approved by the State in accordance with its public involvement process.

Illustrative project means an additional transportation project that may (but is not required to) be included in a financial plan for a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP if reasonable additional resources were to become available.

§ 450.214 Development and content of the long-range statewide transportation plan.

l) The long-range statewide transportation plan may (but is not required to) include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted long-range statewide transportation plan can be implemented, indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. In addition, for **illustrative** purposes, the financial plan may (but is not required to) include additional projects that would be included in the adopted long-range statewide transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.

(m) The State shall not be required to select any project from the **illustrative** list of additional projects included in the financial plan described in paragraph (l) of this section.

§ 450.322 Development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan.

(10) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.

(i) For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).

(ii) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO, public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under §450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.

(iii) The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified.

(iv) In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Starting December 11, 2007, revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect “year of expenditure

dollars," based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).

(v) For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan (*i.e.* , beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.

(vi) For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP.

(vii) For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may (but is not required to) include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.

(viii) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (*i.e.* , by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.

T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Packets\June42009\Attachment 2.docx



MEMORANDUM

TO: Interagency Consultation Committee
FROM: MaryAnn Waldinger, Principal Planner
DATE: May 20, 2009
RE: Review Chair and Vice Chair Rotation

ACTION REQUESTED:

Information only.

BACKGROUND:

In late 2006, the ICC Policy included a rotation order for Chair and Vice Chair. The following rotation order was extracted from the ICC Policy, page 4.

The rotational order of the Chair will be:

- a) ACHD Commuteride representative
- b) Valley Regional Transit representative (VRT)
- c) City of Boise representative
- d) Idaho Transportation Department District 3 representative
- e) Ada County Highway District (ACHD) representative
- f) Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Boise Region representative

The rotational order of the Vice Chair will be:

- a) Valley Regional Transit representative (VRT)
- b) City of Boise representative
- c) Idaho Transportation Department District 3 representative
- d) Ada County Highway District (ACHD) representative
- e) Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Boise Region representative
- f) ACHD Commuteride representative

STATUS:

In 2008, the ICC Chair was the Valley Regional Transit representative and Vice Chair the City of Boise representative per the rotation order above. However, due to the change in representation by VRT, City of Boise representative, Beth Baird, chaired all ICC meetings last year. Therefore, COMPASS staff requests that committee members discuss the existing rotation order and make a recommendation for the next Chair and Vice Chair. This will be an action item at the ICC's June 4, 2009 meeting.

pc: 820 - Committee Support

MAW:dw T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\ICC\Packets\June42009\chair_vicechair.docx