

## April 2011 Board Motion and Status

Direct COMPASS staff to develop a new scope of work to update *Communities in Motion*, utilizing the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) as a drafting committee, based on the outline of the draft scope of work for Regional Sustainability Plan that addresses the following:

1. Will be based on and build upon the *Communities in Motion* plan.
2. Includes a scenario planning process to address concerns.
3. Develops a grant implementation program for member agencies.
4. Meets federal requirements.
5. Includes a logical scope, sequence, budget, and consultant selection process, to be brought back to the COMPASS Board in 60 days.

Motion Element	Status
Use RTAC as a drafting committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Meetings held on April 27, May 4, May 11 and May 18</li> <li>• Meetings scheduled for May 25 and June 1.</li> </ul>
Base on the outline of the draft scope of work for <u>Regional Sustainability Plan</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Using draft scope of work for Regional Sustainability Plan.</li> <li>✓ Original version provided in packet on April 27.</li> <li>✓ Updated version provided at May 18 meeting; additional suggested changes will be brought back in redline/strikeout on May 25.</li> </ul>
Base on and build upon the <i>Communities in Motion</i> plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft scope of work presented on May 11 builds upon <i>Communities in Motion</i>.</li> </ul>
Includes a scenario planning process to address concerns.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial discussion on May 11.</li> <li>• Potential options are listed below; more information was provided May 18.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use "Reality Check" process.</li> <li>○ Choose a process/contractor selected via competitive bid (does not preclude the Urban Land Institute/Reality Check being chosen, but they would be competing against others)</li> <li>○ Each community develops its own scenario.</li> <li>○ Continue to use "Community Choices."</li> <li>○ Other options?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>ACTION</b> taken May 18 to choose a process/contractor via competitive bid.</li> </ul>
Develop a grant implementation program for member agencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduled for discussion on May 25; <b>ACTION</b> on May 25.</li> <li>• Carl is gathering information on options and what others have done. A matrix of questions and examples sent prior to May 25 meeting.</li> </ul>
Meet federal requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Scope of work presented on May 11 includes all federal requirements.</li> <li>✓ "TR" identifies these items ("transportation required").</li> </ul>
Include a logical <u>scope</u> , <u>sequence</u> , <u>budget</u> , and <u>consultant selection process</u> , to be brought back to the COMPASS Board in <u>60 days</u> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope – Discussed May 4 and May 11; additional discussion planned.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>April 27</u> – RTAC chose 2 counties and 2040 horizon year.</li> <li>✓ <u>May 11</u> – Action requested to approve scope. Motions made to refine language and bring back revised scope with redline/strikeout for ACTION on May 18.</li> <li>✓ <u>May 18</u> – Additional changes. Review on May 25.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Sequence – In development/review with RTAC in conjunction with scope. <b>ACTION</b> on May 25.</li> <li>• Budget – In development/review with RTAC in conjunction with scope. <b>ACTION</b> on May 25.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <u>May 4</u>. RTAC directed staff to contact other sustainability partners (from grant application) to determine what they can contribute (done on May 5) and to send outreach budget to RTAC to help them determine if they can assist to offset outreach budget (done on May 4).</li> <li>✓ <u>May 11</u>. Several motions made/passed to decrease budget.</li> <li>✓ <u>May 18</u>. Several motions made/passed to revise budget.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consultant selection process – information handed out on May 18; <b>ACTION</b> on May 25.</li> <li>• Board packets need to be mailed no later than <b>June 8</b>.</li> </ul>

## RTAC Meeting Schedule and Expectations

- Apr 27 - RTAC voted to recommend horizon year 2040 and geographic area of Ada and Canyon Counties.
- May 4 - RTAC approved a motion recommending the initiation of a sustainability plan with:
- all the sustainability factors considered
  - that the transportation component of CIM 2040, be completed by 2014 satisfactory to FHWA
  - that we address all, if possible, of the other components at the inventory level by 2014 and,
  - in the next four weeks select , one or two of those components for sustainability to be addressed in more depth by 2014.
- RTAC approved a motion requesting that COMPASS staff reach out to the parties identified through the TIGER [regional sustainability grant] grant process last year and potentially some of the members from RTAC's subcommittee on sustainability to inform them of where RTAC is going with a scope of work and plan for updating CIM 2040 to see if they are interested, available, and willing to help in addressing the sustainability issues that are in red on the table and resources they may have. The responses were requested by Friday 5/13/11.
- RTAC approved a motion requesting that that the Committee follow up with a list of inventories and plans they individually have to contribute to CIM so it won't have to be redone and forward to Charles Trainor by close of business on Monday, May 9, 2011.
- RTAC approved a motion to request the Demographic Advisory Committee to initiate the discussion on developing a regional growth total for CIM 2040, different methodologies to take us from 2035 to 2040, review the 2010 Census data at a TAZ level and report any anomalies with the 2035 forecast prior to the development of the 2040 control total and, to initiate the discussion on the factors or assumptions to help inform the scenario process.
- May 11 - RTAC approved a motion to drop element 2.5, opinion survey, and reduce element 7.6, printing/distribution, from \$101K to \$50K.
- RTAC approved a motion to reduce element 7.5, public involvement, to \$40K and reduce element 8.9, community and public involvement, to \$20K.
- RTAC approved a motion to reduce element 3.6, economic conditions, to \$20K and reduce element 7.2, transportation financial plan and project cost estimates, to \$30K.
- RTAC approved a motion to reduce element 3.6, economic conditions, to \$30K instead of \$20K and reduce element 7.2, transportation financial plan and project cost estimates, to \$30K.
- RTAC approved a motion to affirm \$80K for 6.3, economic modeling of transportation enhancements, that direct number of workdays be adjusted to the correct number of days, modify title to better describe its purpose related to sustainability and that on the GANTT chart, shading

be extended to the likely duration of the use of the model rather than the existing six month period.

- RTAC approved a motion that element 2.5, opinion survey, be moved to the Public Participation Committee for future scoping and how its value and role in the COMPASS process and identification, to be brought back in future, that element 5.5, online review of growth scenario, be held for discussion until better discussion on growth process and the use of Reality Check or not, and move the budget discussion to next scheduled meeting.
- RTAC approved a motion to direct COMPASS staff to work on Item III in packet, Draft Scope of Work and Plan Elements, to come up with another name (other than JOE) with the purpose statement that it is primarily transportation and secondarily a sustainability plan, and that it be amended and shown in strike-through format.
- RTAC approved a motion to add a deliverable, a visioning guidebook, to Task 4, Trend Analysis.

May 18

- RTAC approved a motion to strike Option 2: Community Determined, as an option for further consideration in scenario planning.
- RTAC approved a motion that COMPASS create a Request for Proposal to hire consultant for task element 5.2, scenario planning, in the scope of work.
- RTAC approved a motion to take element 2.3, street simulation, to zero.
- RTAC approved a motion to reduce element 3.4, environment and natural resources, to \$20K and reduce the workdays from 30 to 20.
- RTAC approved a motion to change element 2.3, street simulation, workdays from 10 to 5 recognizing some staff time will be needed to compile information from other agencies.
- RTAC approved a motion to change element 3.5, emergency services, from \$40K to \$20K and reduce workdays from 20 to 15.
- RTAC approved a motion to change element 6.8, operations/ITS plan update (two counties, all modes), from \$71.2K to \$140K, and change workdays from 10 to 20.
- RTAC approved a motion to add element 7.7 to hire a technical writer including graphics in the amount of \$55K and add 10 workdays.
- RTAC approved a motion to combine element 5.5, online review of growth scenarios, with element 5.2, scenario planning, and increase to total budget amount to \$123,800 and clear that part of funds are for review of growth scenarios.

May 25

- Review consultant selection process
- **ACTION:** Approve consultant selection process
- Review grant implementation program
- **ACTION:** Approve grant implementation program
- Review scope of work, budget, and schedule; make final changes if necessary.

June 1

- Review complete scope of work, budget, and schedule; scenario

planning process; consultant selection process; and grant implementation program

- **ACTION:** Recommendation to the Board

**REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MAY 18, 2011  
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION**



**Special Meeting  
\*\*MINUTES\*\***

- ATTENDEES:** Sabrina Anderson, Ada County Highway District  
Mary Barker, Valley Regional Transit  
Clair Bowman, City of Nampa  
Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation  
Michael Garz, Idaho Transportation Department-  
District 3  
Caleb Hood, City of Meridian, **Vice Chair**  
Wendy Howell, City of Middleton, **Chair**  
Kathleen Lacey, City of Boise  
Megan Leatherman, Ada County Development Services  
Jeff Lowe, Ada County Highway District (*for Ryan Head*)  
David Luft, Department of Environmental Quality  
Robb MacDonald, City of Caldwell  
Patricia Nilsson, City of Boise  
Eric Shannon, Nampa Highway District No. 1  
Deanna Smith, Public Participation Committee
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jennifer Carson, Canyon County Development Services  
Chris Collins, Mayor, City of Notus  
Steve Hasson, City of Kuna  
Chris Hopper, Canyon Highway District No. 4  
Rob Howarth, Central District Health Department (*Ex-Officio*)  
Casey Jones, Boise State University  
Nathan Mitchell, Mayor, City of Star  
Nichol Baird Spencer, City of Eagle  
Craig Telford, Mayor, City of Parma  
Jenah Thornborrow, City of Garden City
- OTHERS PRESENT:** Jeff Barnes, City of Nampa  
Nancy Brecks, COMPASS  
Nathan Dale, COMPASS  
Sonia Hennum, Kittelson & Associates  
Liisa Itkonen, COMPASS  
Amy Luft, COMPASS  
Carl Miller, COMPASS  
Matt Stoll, COMPASS  
Toni Tisdale, COMPASS  
Charles Trainor, COMPASS  
Jeanne Urlezaga, COMPASS  
Ted Vanegas, Valley Regional Transit  
Cheyne Weston, Boise Parks & Recreation  
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

## **CALL TO ORDER**

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

## **UPDATE FROM DEMOGRAPHIC ADVISOR COMMITTEE (DAC)**

Jeff Lowe gave an overview of the DAC's May 11, 2011 meeting and summarized DAC's mission.

## **REVIEW SCENARIO PLANNING PROCESS OPTIONS**

Carl Miller reviewed the Scenario Planning Process options.

After discussion, **Kathleen Lacey moved and Deanna Smith seconded to strike Option 2: Community Determined, as an option for further consideration. Motion passed unanimously.**

After further discussion, **Tricia Nilsson moved and Jon Cecil seconded to include in scope of work the scenario planning process based on the six phased scenario planning framework from FHWA, keep in \$73K for that effort of which \$5K be included for phase 1, apply for consultant resources to set up the scope of work, and that the scope of work include in the assumption that RTAC will be engaged in making a recommendation along with input from DAC and any other COMPASS standing committees.**

After discussion, **Sabrina Anderson made a substitute motion and Clair Bowman seconded that RTAC approve Option 1 with the clear understanding that it is not a full start over, and that the information on Community Choices 2006, 2010, and Census 2010 information be provided to participants at beginning.**

After discussion, **substitute motion failed with two ayes.**

After further discussion, **the original motion failed.**

**Jeff Lowe moved and Clair Bowman seconded to hire a consultant to follow the draft scope of work, budget and schedule, as may be adopted, with time allotted to each specific task, to be negotiated upon selection of a consultant.**

After discussion, **motion failed.**

**Clair Bowman moved and Sabrina Anderson seconded to hire a consultant to implement the scenario planning process, that the base includes 2010 census, approved developments, the existing CIM that we incorporate the Community Choices forecast policies, that we revisit those policies to reconfirm their appropriateness and that the recommendations come back to RTAC and DAC for recommendation to the COMPASS Board.**

After discussion, **Deanna Smith made an alternate motion and Kathleen Lacey seconded that COMPASS create a Request for Proposal to hire consultant for task element 5.2, scenario planning, in the scope of work.**

After further discussion, **motion passed with eight ayes and five nays.**

## **REVIEW DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK, BUDGET AND SCHEDULE**

Liisa Itkonen briefly reviewed draft scope of work.

After discussion, **Sabrina Anderson moved and Clair Bowman seconded to:**

- **drop element 3.4, environmental and natural resources, to \$20K;**
- **drop element 3.5, emergency services (safety and security) to \$20K;**
- **drop element 2.4, graphics, to \$20K;**
- **cut element 2.3, street simulation;**
- **add element 7.7, for a technical writer in the amount of \$55K ;**
- **move element 2.4, graphics, under 7.7 so graphics and technical writer are under same amount;**
- **savings realized from element 2.3, street simulation, and additional \$20K, would go to element 6.8, operations/ITS plan update, which would increase to \$115K.**

**The reason for cutting street simulation; it's nice to have but street simulation has been done through other efforts. If there is money to fund the outcome, it would be nice, but no enhancement money. The ITS plan because is out of date. ACHD and Nampa may be able to add funds to make region-wide ITS plan.**

Matt Stoll requested a simplified motion without commentary.

**Sabrina Anderson restated the motion and Clair Bowman seconded to reduce 3.4 to \$20K, 3.5 to \$20K, 2.4 cut to \$20K but move to it under the new 7.7 for \$55K, cut 2.3, labeled 7.7 technical writer/ graphics, and increase 6.8 to \$115K.**

After discussion, **Tricia Nilsson made a substitute motion and Clair Bowman seconded to add a technical writer under element 7.7 for \$55K and increase 6.8 to \$115K.**

After further discussion, **Sabrina Anderson, Tricia Nilsson, and Clair Bowman withdrew the motion and substitute motion.**

**Sabrina Anderson moved and Tricia Nilsson seconded to take element 2.3, street simulation, to zero.**

After discussion, **motion passed with two nays and one abstention.**

**Sabrina Anderson moved and Eric Shannon seconded to cut element 3.4, environment and natural resources, to \$20K.**

After discussion, **Sabrina Anderson amended the motion and Eric Shannon seconded cut element 3.4, environment and natural resources, to \$20K and include 20 workdays and on element 2.3, street simulation, cut the workdays from 10 to zero. Motion failed.**

**Sabrina Anderson moved and Caleb Hood seconded to reduce element 3.4, environment and natural resources, to \$20K and reduce the workdays from 30 to 20. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Sabrina Anderson moved and Tricia Nilsson seconded to change element 2.3, street simulation, workdays from 10 to 5 recognizing some staff time will be needed to compile information from other agencies. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Sabrina Anderson moved and Clair Bowman seconded to change element 3.5, emergency services, from \$40K to \$20K and reduce workdays from 20 to 15. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Sabrina Anderson moved and Clair Bowman seconded to change element 6.8, operations/ITS plan update (two counties, all modes), from \$71.2K to \$125, and change workdays from 10 to 20.**

After discussion, **Sabrina Anderson amended the motion and Clair Bowman seconded, to change element 6.8, operations/ITS plan update (two counties, all modes), from \$71.2K to \$140K, and change workdays from 10 to 20. Motion passed with two nays.**

**Sabrina Anderson moved and Kathleen Lacey seconded to add element 7.7 to hire a technical writer including graphics in the amount of \$55K and add 10 workdays. Motion passed unanimously.**

**Caleb Hood moved to change the name of element 5.5 from online review of growth scenarios to review of growth scenarios and reduce amount by \$30K.**

After discussion, Caleb Hood removed the motion.

**Caleb Hood moved and Sabrina Anderson seconded to combine element 5.5, online review of growth scenarios, with element 5.2, scenario planning, and increase the total budget amount to \$123,800; part of funds are for review of growth scenarios.**

After discussion, **motion passed.**

## **OTHER**

**A. Next Regular Meeting:** Wednesday, May 25, 2011, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.**

**044. SMALL PURCHASES.**

**01. General.** Small purchases are those purchases or procurements expected to cost one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) or less. Costs are determined based on the following:

- a. One-time purchases of property; or
- b. Total cost of a contract for services, including renewal or extension periods.

**02. Splitting of Requirements.** Acquisition requirements shall not be artificially divided to avoid bid statutes, rules or policies.

**03. Procedure.** Unless impractical or impossible and documented in the file, these small purchase procedures require the acquisition to be publicly posted. Except as otherwise provided in this rule, no less than three (3) vendors having a significant Idaho presence as defined by Section 67-2349, Idaho Code, shall be solicited to submit quotations. Award shall be made to the responsible and responsive bidder offering the lowest acceptable quotation. The purchasing file will be fully documented for unacceptable quotations. Should it be impractical or impossible to solicit three (3) vendors, the file shall be fully documented and every effort should still be made to obtain the most favorable terms, conditions and price possible.

**04. Form of Request for Quotation.** Unless otherwise prohibited by the buyer, the request for quotation and the quotation may be written, oral, electronic, telephonic or facsimile.

**05. Quoting Time.** The quoting time shall be determined by the buyer and should provide sufficient time for the vendor to prepare and return a quotation. The amount of time shall take into consideration such factors as complexity, urgency, availability of property and the number and location of vendors.

**06. Open Contracts.** Property available under single agency or open contracts shall be purchased under such contracts and not as a small purchase under this rule unless otherwise authorized by the administrator.

**07. Professional, Consultant, and Information Technology Services.** Professional, consultant, and information technology services acquired under this rule, where the services are reasonably expected to cost one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) or less through a fixed price/not to exceed price contract for a non-renewable term not to exceed one (1) year, may be acquired if 03.Procedure is followed, in accordance with good business practice and in the best interest of COMPASS, and if the service is not available under an open contract.

**08. Purchases in Amounts Less Than Ten Thousand Dollars.** If the property to be acquired is expected to cost less than ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), it may be acquired as each agency sees fit, in accordance with good business practice and in the best interest of COMPASS, and if the property is not available under an open contract.

**Grant Incentive Program Examples**

**Item IV.**

Agency	COMPASS Key Decision Points	Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)	Metro	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC)	North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
<b>Location</b>		Atlanta, GA	Portland, OR	Oakland, CA	Albany, NY	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	Philadelphia, PA	Denver, CO
<b>Program Name</b>	What is the name of the program?	Livable Centers Initiative	Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Implementation Program	Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)	Community and Transportation Linkage Planning Program (Linkage Program)	Sustainable Development Funding Program	Transportation and Community Development Initiative (TCDI)	Programs include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FasTracks,</li> <li>• Urban Center Planning, and</li> <li>• Station Area Master Plans (STAMPs).</li> </ul>
<b>Goals</b>	What are the main goals?  Will the grants promote transportation? Transit? Housing? Economic Development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage a diversity of mixed-income residential neighborhoods, employment, shopping and recreation choices at the center/corridor level;</li> <li>• Provide access to a range of travel modes including transit, roadways, walking and biking;</li> <li>• Develop an outreach process that promotes the involvement of all stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Causing construction of higher density housing, mixed-use projects, and transit developments, through partnerships with the private sector;</li> <li>• Developing urban building types;</li> <li>• Increasing the modal share of transit and pedestrian trips within station areas;</li> <li>• Leveraging and focusing public expenditures within station areas to support Metro's 2040 Growth Concept.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support infill or transit-oriented development;</li> <li>• Support well-designed, high-density housing and mixed use developments;</li> <li>• Support collaborative projects;</li> <li>• Improve a range of transportation choices;</li> <li>• Enhance a community's sense of place and quality of life;</li> <li>• Invest in projects that are ready to begin construction in the near term.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban revitalization;</li> <li>• Improve street connectivity and access management;</li> <li>• Develop activity centers;</li> <li>• Develop transit corridors;</li> <li>• Encourage a greater mix and intensity of land uses;</li> <li>• Develop bicycle and pedestrian-friendly design standards;</li> <li>• Create an integrated multi-modal transportation network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respond to local initiatives for Town Centers, Mixed-Use Growth Centers, Transit Oriented Developments, Infill/Brownfield Developments, and Pedestrian Oriented Projects;</li> <li>• Complement rail investments with coordinated investments in park-and-ride, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities;</li> <li>• Reduce the growth in vehicle miles traveled per person;</li> <li>• Promote economic development through public/private partnerships.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support local planning projects that will lead to more residential, employment, or retail opportunities;</li> <li>• Improve the overall character and quality of life and to retain and attract business;</li> <li>• Enhance the existing transportation infrastructure to reduce the demands on the network;</li> <li>• Reduce congestion and improve the transportation system's efficiency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide relevant and timely information to help policy makers, business leaders, and the public make informed decisions regarding transit-oriented development;</li> <li>• Locate new housing and employment near transit;</li> <li>• Increase the rate of construction of alternative transportation facilities;</li> <li>• Reduce single-occupant vehicle trips;</li> <li>• Reduce municipal and industrial water use;</li> <li>• Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</li> </ul>
<b>Eligible Applicants</b>	Who is eligible? COMPASS members only? COMPASS? Non-profits?	Government: agencies (city, county, state), non profits	Developers: (private, non-profit, institutional)	Public agencies	Local governments: (cities, towns, villages), counties, non-profits and public authorities also eligible with letter of support	Planning: cities, counties, special districts, transit agencies  Infrastructure: cities, transit	Municipalities and counties identified as environmental justice (EJ) areas and community development corporations	Any municipality with a FasTracks Station or DRCOG designated "urban center."

Agency	COMPASS Key Decision Points	Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)	Metro	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC)	North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
					from a local government.	agencies, counties with a private developer sponsor	(CDCs)	
<b>Partnerships &amp; Public Participation</b>	Do we promote partnerships? EJ outreach? If so, how?				CDTC staff has worked with community-based organizations serving EJ communities.		Local jurisdictions are only eligible to apply for a grant if they include an area identified as an EJ. All final TCDI plans are also required to include an EJ element.	
<b>Eligible Activities</b>	What are the eligible activities?  Who administers/monitors the program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Studies</li> <li>• Transportation Construction Projects;</li> <li>• Scenario planning;</li> <li>• Preparation of a regional comprehensive plan;</li> <li>• Update the regional transportation demand model to better address land use development;</li> <li>• Provide design guidelines and information, training or technical assistance on complete streets;</li> <li>• Created a Lifelong Communities Program with grant funding from the Robert Woods Johnson Foundation to promote housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed-use TOD projects (funds easements, land acquisition, operations including planning and feasibility studies);</li> <li>• Prepare a regional comprehensive plan;</li> <li>• Pay staff or consultants to track and monitor development or land values in the region to identify opportunities for strategic transportation investments;</li> <li>• Land Acquisition/ Banking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital projects;</li> <li>• Station area planning grants;</li> <li>• Technical assistance grants;</li> <li>• Scenario planning;</li> <li>• Integrate land use criteria into the TIP Process, such as considering minimum zoning requirements;</li> <li>• Update the regional transportation demand model to better address land use development;</li> <li>• Provide design guidelines and information, training or technical assistance on complete streets;</li> <li>• Land Acquisition/ Banking;</li> <li>• Adopted a TOD Policy that requires new</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Studies;</li> <li>• TIP projects;</li> <li>• Scenario planning</li> <li>• Integrate land use criteria into the TIP Process, such as considering minimum zoning requirements;</li> <li>• Participated in the development of a Transit Propensity Index (TPI) to forecast the potential for transit ridership and service productivity along different corridors given local conditions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning studies;</li> <li>• Sustainable Infrastructure Projects;</li> <li>• Land-banking;</li> <li>• Scenario planning;</li> <li>• Integrate land use criteria into the TIP Process, such as considering minimum zoning requirements;</li> <li>• Update the regional transportation demand model to better address land use development;</li> <li>• Pay staff or consultants to track and monitor development of land values in the region to identify opportunities for transportation investments.</li> <li>• Provide design guidelines and information,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning and Land Use studies;</li> <li>• Reuse and Revitalization studies;</li> <li>• Transportation and Transit studies;</li> <li>• Prepare a regional comprehensive plan;</li> <li>• Provide design guidelines and information, training or technical assistance on complete streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Station area master plans;</li> <li>• Urban Center plans;</li> <li>• Scenario planning</li> <li>• Prepare a regional comprehensive plan;</li> <li>• Integrate land use criteria into the TIP Process, such as considering minimum zoning requirements;</li> <li>• Update the regional transportation demand model to better address land use development;</li> <li>• Provide design guidelines and information, training or technical;</li> <li>• assistance on complete streets;</li> <li>• Established an urban growth boundary/area to help stage growth</li> </ul>

Agency	COMPASS Key Decision Points	Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)	Metro	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC)	North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
		and transportation choices for senior citizens, in order to help them more easily "age in place."		transit investments meet minimum housing and development thresholds.		training or technical assistance on complete streets; • Formed a working group to improve school siting.		and promote an increase in overall regional density, known as the Mile High Compact.
<b>Schedule</b>	When does this program begin?  Follow the TIP schedule for project selection?  Timeline for project completion?		Metro's TOD Program accepts project proposals on a rolling basis. Projects are not prioritized among competing applications.			The Program has issued three calls for projects since it was first created in 2001, but does not have a standardized project solicitation timeframe.	Formal evaluation cycle every two years.	
<b>Scoring Process and Criteria</b>	What eligibility criteria, evaluation methods, and prioritization criteria are used? Project readiness?  Do they differ by mode, project type, or any other category?  How do we tie the grant to the regional vision?  What is an appropriate required match?  How do we use Performance Measures to grade existing and/or future participation?  Do we encourage/require participation		A steering committee evaluates how well applications meet the goals of the program and makes a recommendation to fund the project and the project moves forward unless there is an objection from the Metro Council.	Additional points for including affordable units in project applications.		The SDF Program used a very detailed online application with 61 questions addressing the project's information, site description, budget, and community profile.  Applicants received additional points when they met certain criteria. Extra points are given for projects that: • Include a pedestrian friendly block structure; • Made a pedestrian, bicycle, or transit connection; • Included resource protection and	In order to apply for a study, applicants must be a local jurisdiction that meets the following eligibility criteria: • Identified as an EJ area; • Identified as a "center" in DVRPC's long-range transportation plan; • Identified by being transit accessible by DVRPC.  Applications are then evaluated and prioritized by DVRPC committees based on the following four criteria: • Does the project relate to and serve to enhance the	

Agency	COMPASS Key Decision Points	Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)	Metro	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC)	North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
	<p>by other agencies?</p> <p>Should we promote specific geographic areas? Low-income areas? High unemployment areas?</p>					<p>enhancement activities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within a ¼ mile of a park, school library, or police station;</li> <li>• Included 100 units of workforce housing;</li> <li>• Preserved historic, cultural, or archaeological features;</li> <li>• Redeveloped a Brownfield site.</li> </ul> <p>NCTCOG's MPO Policy Board makes final selection decisions, based on staff recommendations.</p>	<p>transportation network? (30%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the project generate an increased demand in development and density to support transit as well as enhance the quality of life? (30%)</li> <li>• Does the project provide a clear implementation strategy that includes community involvement, particularly underserved populations? (20%)</li> <li>• Is the applicant ready to proceed and complete the project in three years if awarded the funds? (20%)</li> </ul> <p>Final selections is made by the DVRPC Board.</p>	
<b>Implementation</b>	<p>How do we monitor project completion? How are time extensions handled? Are there penalties?</p> <p>How do we measure success? What resources will be used to administer the project? What projects will not be</p>	<p>ARC developed a manual with guidelines for project sponsors and holds workshops to provide project sponsors with information on implementation requirements.</p> <p>ARC hired a law firm to conduct a legal review of</p>		<p>MTC provides technical assistance and guidance to help project sponsors administer Federal funds.</p> <p>MTC conducts regular project check-ins with local sponsors at 30, 60, and 90 percent completion and instituted an agency wide policy</p>	<p>CDTC works closely with local cities and towns who request help with re-zoning to ensure that updated zoning codes include transit, bike and pedestrian supportive elements.</p>			<p>DRCOG adopted a "3 Strikes" policy where the third time a local project sponsor lapses on obligating its funds in the required timeframe, it has to appear before the DRCOG board to make a case for keeping its project funds.</p>

Agency	COMPASS Key Decision Points	Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)	Metro	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC)	North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
	completed?	<p>regional land use and transportation to establish legal authority of the COG in land use and development issues.</p> <p>ARC hired a project engineer to conduct design review on concept reports and construction plans, and a Project Manager who tracks projects, provides technical assistance and acts as a liaison between local governments and the state DOT.</p>		<p>on the timely use of STP/CMAQ funds to help ensure that projects continue to move forward once they are granted funding.</p>				
<b>Evaluation</b>	<p>How do we show success of the program?</p> <p>How do we evaluate the program and make changes?</p>	<p>ARC has an ongoing evaluation and monitoring initiative for its LCI program that is divided into two parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <i>Breaking Ground Report</i> is compiled every six months. ARC staff contact grantees who have received LCI implementation funds to gather information on project status.</li> <li>• Every two years, ARC staff prepares a report to better understand the accomplishments,</li> </ul>		<p>MTC incorporated 11 performance outcome targets into its long-range plan.</p> <p>MTC also conducted an in-depth <i>Performance Assessment Report</i> that analyzed the performance of various investment packages and individual projects.</p> <p>In 2007, MTC conducted a 10-year review and evaluation of all of its completed projects.</p>			<p>DVRPC prepares a <i>Tracking Progress</i> report after each update to the region's long-range transportation plan.</p> <p>DVRPC has completed two evaluation reports that examine its TCDI Program. These reports provide an overview of the TCDI program and evaluate the administration, project selection, and funding investments that</p>	<p>DRCOG prepares a <i>Measuring Progress</i> report every two years, which tracks progress towards regional goals established in the Metro Vision Plan.</p>

Agency	COMPASS Key Decision Points	Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)	Metro	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	Capital District Transportation Committee (CDTC)	North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG)	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
		strengths, and challenges of the LCI Program. A survey is distributed to communities who have received LCI funding.		Recommendations were made to improve the effectiveness of the program.			have been leveraged by TCDI studies throughout the DVRPC planning region.	
<b>Results</b>		<p>In 10 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 107 LCI Planning Studies</li> <li>• 57 Supplemental Studies</li> <li>• 79 Transportation Construction Projects—31 completed, 18 under construction, 30 in preliminary engineering or right-of-way.</li> <li>• Approximately 64% pedestrian, 14% bike/ped, 6% transit-supportive facility, 6% multi-use path, 8% roadway operations, 1% roadway capacity;</li> <li>• From 2000-2007, 8% of housing, 21% of commercial, and 67% of office built in the region was located in an LCI study area (3.4% of the region's total land area).</li> </ul>	<p>In 12 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 built TOD projects</li> <li>• \$300 million in development activity</li> <li>• 543,000 annual transit trips</li> <li>• 2,100 residential units</li> <li>• 240,000 sq. ft. of retail and office</li> </ul>	<p>In 8 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 162 capital projects</li> <li>• 33 planning grants</li> </ul>	<p>In 10 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funded a total of 66 planning studies</li> <li>• Study sponsors include 39 separate urban, suburban and rural municipalities and counties as well as not-for-profits and other public entities.</li> <li>• Local Planning Boards have become more aware of issues such as sidewalks and are asking more of developers;</li> <li>• Studies have encouraged developers to be more creative with some of their projects;</li> <li>• Studies have led to adaptive reuse of buildings in the studied corridors.</li> </ul>	<p>In 9 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 infrastructure projects.</li> </ul>	<p>In 8 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funded 171 planning studies</li> <li>• Planning and Land Use: 50 projects (29%)</li> <li>• Reuse and Revitalization: 41 projects (24%)</li> <li>• Transportation and Transit: 80 projects (47%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funded STAMPs for 28 stations, 19 of which are located in or are within a quarter mile of an Urban Center.</li> <li>• Allocated TIP funding for 14 transportation infrastructure projects located within an Urban Center, and seven transportation infrastructure projects located near and supporting an Urban Center.</li> </ul>

## **DRAFT Scope of Work to Prepare for a Regional Transportation/Sustainability Plan Communities in Motion 2040: Regional Long-Range Transportation and Sustainability Plan**

### **Purpose**

Local agencies and institutions involved in land use, transportation, housing, natural resources, public health, and economic development will partner to develop an integrated, long-range (20-30 year) regional sustainability-transportation and sustainability plan to:

- Meet federal requirements for a long-range transportation plan,
- Better coordinate investments,
- Shape future growth without undermining the region's natural resource base and environmental quality, and
- ~~Meet federal requirements for a long-range transportation plan,~~ and
- Better position the region to compete for federal funding.

This regional sustainability-plan will help guide public and private investments and land use decisions to efficiently manage public dollars, enhance economic competitiveness, and provide choices in transportation, housing, and job opportunities to all residents.

### **Expected Benefits**

Pursuing regional transportation and sustainability planning in tandem will help align policies and goals across the region and among planning elements (e.g., transportation, housing, etc.). It will also build partnerships to connect stakeholders and promote "ownership" of those policies and goals across jurisdictions. Closer coordination of transportation, infrastructure, housing, ~~transportation,~~ and economic development planning among communities and across the region can help leverage resources and efforts, and yield better sustainable outcomes with existing resources.

A broader planning process, both in terms of scope of the plan and the partners who are involved, will advise the COMPASS Board and staff on how the regional long-range transportation plan (Communities in Motion) and its implementing programs can better best support land use, housing, economic development, infrastructure, natural resource, health, and service coordination objectives.

Aligning ~~the regional long-range transportation plan~~ Communities in Motion goals, policies, and performance measures better more closely with regional sustainability objectives will help:

- Incorporate supportive work elements in the annual Unified Planning Work Program,
- Review and revise prioritization criteria used to program federal funds to align regional transportation funding priorities with regional sustainability objectives,
- Integrate pertinent strategies and objectives into corridor studies and subarea plans, and
- Identify regional corridors and activity areas for transit-supportive investments.

Regional sustainability planning will also enhance communities' competitiveness for funding, as both federal and philanthropic grants now often include efforts to address regional sustainability as one of the rating criteria.

### Notes Assumptions / Caveats

- The scope of work outlined below includes main themes and steps; details will be developed by the planning team.
- This scope identifies which items are federally required for a long-range transportation plan/planning process ("TR"), which are proposed ~~as be~~ part of the regional long-range transportation plan/planning process ("TP"), and which are proposed as part of a regional plan for sustainable development, beyond transportation elements ("S").
- The sequence of the tasks may vary from this [outline scope of work](#); some of the tasks will be done concurrently.
- [This scope of work includes Attachment A. Budget and Attachment B. Schedule. Attachments A and B include some additional elements that provide more details to the items discussed in this broad scope of work.](#)
- COMPASS will prepare the plan, but it is assumed that member and other partner agencies will provide assistance as appropriate. ~~Additional resources (e.g., consultants and/or additional COMPASS staff) may be necessary to provide expertise not available with existing staff, members, or partners.~~

### Getting Organized

#### **1. Building the Team / Commitment (Stakeholders)**

- Form a leadership team: identify and engage local and regional leaders who will champion regional sustainability planning
- Form the planning team:
  - Develop a detailed scope of work and schedule
  - Develop a data management plan and system to accommodate existing and newly acquired data (S)

#### **2. Public Participation (General public)**

- Develop a public participation plan and outreach strategy:
  - Identify diverse and innovative outreach tools (including Internet and visualization tools, such as street simulation [TP]) (TR)
  - Identify underserved communities and the tools/resources needed to reach out to and engage those communities (TR)
  - Define measurement tools to measure public awareness and opinions on plan-related topics and success in engaging the public, particularly underserved communities (TP; biennial random opinion survey)
- Involve and engage the public throughout the process

#### Deliverables:

- Leadership team (TP) (COMPASS Board for long-range transportation plan only; additional members for full sustainability plan)
- Planning team (TP) (Regional Technical Advisory Committee for long-range transportation plan only; additional members for full sustainability plan)
- Scope of work and schedule (TP)

- Data management plan (S)
- Public participation plan (TR)

## **Where We Are Today**

### **3. Existing Conditions Inventory (Data and Plans)**

- Inventory existing baseline data and who has them (listed below are baseline data needs to fulfill federal requirements; see Attachment A for complete list of data needs beyond federal requirements)
  - Population and employment (TR)
  - Land use (TR)
  - Transportation system (TR)
  - Environment and natural resources (TR)
  - Emergency services (safety/security) (TR)
  - Economic conditions (TR)
- Inventory existing relevant/related plans, who develops them, and when updates are required (listed below are what is needed to fulfill federal requirements; see Attachment A for complete list of plans proposed for inventory beyond federal requirements)
  - Transportation plans (TR)
  - Comprehensive plans (TR)
  - Air quality plans/environmental plans (TR)
  - Emergency services (safety/security) (TR)

Deliverables:

- [Summary report of where we are today \(existing conditions\)](#)
- [Summary report of existing plans with identification of planning gaps](#)
- [Summary report identifying policies, priorities, and strategies that existing plans have in common and where they contradict each other](#)
- ~~Final plan to incorporate information on existing conditions, plans, and data gaps in logical locations throughout the document.~~
- ~~Final plan to identify policies, priorities, and strategies (from plans) and highlight areas where there are conflicts and/or inconsistencies.~~

## **Direction and Issues**

### **4. Trend Analysis**

- Describe regional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats based on where we are today (S)
- Identify likely trends (where we are heading), including projected transportation demand (TR) (S)
- Continue public involvement process (TR)

Deliverables:

- ~~Discussion of regional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, and future trends to be incorporated in final plan (TR/S)~~
- [Report of regional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and future trends](#)

- [A guidebook highlighting existing conditions and future trends to be used in the visioning process \(Phase 5\).](#)

## **Where We Want to Be**

### **5. Visioning**

Visioning will be based on information obtained via the existing conditions inventory, trend analysis, and *Communities in Motion 2035*, the current regional long-range transportation plan for Ada and Canyon Counties.

- Define /describe planning assumptions (future growth, land use, travel patterns, employment, congestion, economic activity, etc.) (TR)
- Conduct scenario planning to describe what the preferred future would look like (TP)
  - Define guiding principles, vision, and goals
  - Hold workshops; use online tools
- Define a general regional “umbrella” vision for the future (TP/S)
- Assess capital investment and other strategies to preserve infrastructure for future needs (TR/S)
- Continue public involvement process (TR)

Deliverables:

- Report of the regional sustainability vision, including guiding principles, goals, and policies, and a map of the preferred development/growth pattern (TP)

### **6. Additional Data and Studies** (additional detail in Attachment A)

- Identify data and policy gaps (S)
- Conduct research to fill data gaps, including modeling economic benefits of transportation enhancements (TP/S)
- Identify operational and management strategies to improve transportation (TR)
  - Consider results of the Congestion Management Process (TR)
  - Include alternative transportation (transit, bike, pedestrian, enhancements) (TR)
  - Include description of proposed facilities (TR)
  - Update operations/intelligent transportation systems plans (TP)
- Identify potential environmental mitigation activities for areas affected by transportation facilities in the plan (TR)

### **7. Prepare the Plan**

- Compile a regional sustainability plan that integrates all federally required and regionally important elements (TR/S)
- Develop a financial plan/forecast showing how the transportation plan (TR) and other plan elements can be implemented (S)
- Make an air quality conformity determination for the planned transportation system (TR)
- Continue public involvement process; public review of draft plan (TR)

Deliverables:

- [A draft of a regional transportation and sustainability plan.](#)

- A final regional transportation and sustainability plan that includes all federally required elements of a regional long-range transportation plan (~~S~~/TR/S)

## **Getting Where We Want to Be**

### **8. Implementation**

- Re-energize the leadership team to champion the vision (S/TP)
- Adopt plan (COMPASS Board, individual member agencies, other partners) (TR)
- Align policies (based on findings in Task 3) (S/TP)
- Work with individual communities as they develop and adapt their implementation strategies within the regional vision (S/TP)
- Develop mini-grant program to facilitate plan implementation (TP)
- Create partnerships to facilitate implementation (S)
- Develop performance measures to assess progress (S/TP)
- Track/monitor implementation (S/TP)
- Plan for change: recognizing that conditions are not static, the implementing policies of the plan are adaptive to balance the needs of today with those of tomorrow (S/TP)
- Outreach in/by individual communities (S/TP)
- Continue public involvement process (S/TP)
- Examine “lessons learned” and begin to develop a framework for the process of updating the plan (determine time frame for updates) (TR)

## Item VI. Budget for Draft Scope of Work and Plan Elements

	Plan Elements		COMPASS Workdays	Consultant/ Direct Cost \$	After May 11 RTAC	After May 18 RTAC
<b>Getting Organized</b>						
<b>1. Building the Team/Commitment (Stakeholders)</b>						
1.1	Leadership team	TP	20			
1.2	Planning team	TP	20			
1.3	Scope of work and schedule	TP	50			
1.4	Data management plan	S				
<b>2. Public Participation (General Public)</b>						
2.1	Develop Public Participation Plan	TR	5			
2.2	Visualization	TR	50			
2.3	Street simulation	TP	5	15,000	15,000	0
2.4	Graphics	TP	20	40,000	40,000	40,000
2.5	Opinion Survey	TP	0	105,000	0	0
<b>Where We Are Today</b>						
<b>3. Existing Conditions (Data and Plans)</b>						
3.1	Population and Employment	TR	50			
3.2	Land Use	TR	50			
3.3	Transportation system	TR	15			
3.4	Environment and natural resources	TR	20	35,000	35,000	20,000
3.5	Emergency services (safety and security)	TR	15	40,000	40,000	20,000
3.6	Economic conditions	TR	25	45,000	30,000	30,000
3.7	Water – source, surface, waste - infrastructure	S				
3.8	Brownfield inventory	S				
3.9	Education facilities	S				
3.10	Housing needs assessment	S				
3.11	Agriculture conditions	S				
3.12	Food system (production and processing)	S				
3.13	Health (key public health issues and indicators)	S				
3.14	Policy inventory	TP/S	30			
3.15	Transportation plans	TR	40			
3.16	Comprehensive plans	TR	40			
3.17	Air quality/environmental plans	TR	40			
3.18	Emergency services (safety /security) plans	TR	40			
3.19	Housing plans	S				
3.20	Economic development plans	S				
3.21	Community infrastructure plans (water, electricity, natural gas, etc.)	S				
<b>Direction and Issues</b>						
<b>4. Trend Analysis</b>						
4.1	Regional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats	S				
4.2	Trend analysis	S				
4.3	Projected transportation demand	TR	50			
4.4	Public involvement	TR	60	41,000	41,000	41,000
<b>Where We Want to Be</b>						
<b>5. Visioning</b>						
5.1	Planning assumptions (future growth, land use, travel patterns, employment, congestion, economic activity)	TR	30			
5.2	Scenario planning	TP	130	73,800	73,800	123,800
5.3	General regional vision for the future	TP/S	40			

5.4	Capital investment and other strategies to preserve infrastructure for future needs	TR/S	30			
5.5	Online review of growth scenario	TP	0	60,000	60,000	0
5.6	Public involvement	TR	60	72,000	72,000	72,000
<b>6. Additional data and studies</b>						
6.1	Identification of data and policy gaps	S				
6.2	Research to fill data gaps	S				
6.3	Economic modeling of benefits of infrastructure enhancements and policy implementation	TP/S	230	80,000	80,000	80,000
6.4	Operational and management strategies	TR	60			
6.5	Congestion management process	TR	60			
6.6	Alternative transportation (transit, bike, pedestrian, enhancements)	TR	40			
6.7	Description of proposed (transportation) facilities	TR	50			
6.8	Operations/ITS plan update	TP	20	71,200	71,200	140,000
6.9	Potential environmental mitigation activities	TR	50			
<b>7. Prepare the plan</b>						
7.1	Federally required and regionally significant elements	TR/S	200			
7.2	Transportation financial plan and project cost estimates	TR	10	60,000	30,000	30,000
7.3	Financial plan for how (other) plan elements can be implemented	S				
7.4	Air quality conformity determination	TR	30			
7.5	Public involvement (review of draft plan)	TR	50	80,000	40,000	40,000
7.6	Printing/distribution	TR	30	101,000	50,000	50,000
7.7	Technical Writer	TP/S	10			55,000
<b>Getting Where We Want to Be</b>						
<b>8. Implementation</b>						
8.1	Re-energized leadership team	S/TP	5			
8.2	Plan adoption	TR	20			
8.3	Aligning policies (based on findings in Task 3)	S/TP	20			
8.4	Community strategies for plan implementation	S/TP	5			
8.5	Mini-grant program	TP	20			
8.6	Partnerships to facilitate implementation	S				
8.7	Performance measures	S/TP	10			
8.8	Tracking and monitoring of implementation	S/TP	20			
8.9	Community and public involvement	S/TP	10	38,000	20,000	20,000
8.10	Framework for updating the plan	TR	20			
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1905</b>	<b>\$ 957,000</b>	<b>\$ 698,000</b>	<b>\$761,800</b>

\$30K to 5.2

TR = Transportation Required

TP = Transportation Proposed

S = Sustainability

## Item VI. Schedule for Draft Scope of Work and Plan Elements

Plan Elements		Jul 11 - Sep 11	Oct 11 - Dec 11	Jan 12 - Mar 12	Apr 12 - Jun 12	Jul 12 - Sep 12	Oct 12 - Dec 12	Jan 13 - Mar 13	Apr 13 - Jun 13	Jul 13 - Sep 13	Oct 13 - Dec 13	Jan 14 - Mar 14	Apr 14 - Jun 14	Jul 14 - Sep 14	Oct 14 - Dec 14
<b>Getting Organized</b>															
<b>1. Building the Team/Commitment (Stakeholders)</b>															
1.1	Leadership team	TP													
1.2	Planning team	TP													
1.3	Scope of work and schedule	TP													
1.4	Data management plan	S													
<b>2. Public Participation (General Public)</b>															
2.1	Develop Public Participation Plan	TR													
2.2	Visualization	TR													
2.3	Street simulation	TP													
2.4	Graphics	TP													
<b>Where We Are Today</b>															
<b>3. Existing Conditions (Data and Plans)</b>															
3.1	Population and Employment	TR													
3.2	Land Use	TR													
3.3	Transportation system	TR													
3.4	Environment and natural resources	TR													
3.5	Emergency services (safety and security)	TR													
3.6	Economic conditions	TR													
3.7	Water – source, surface, waste - infrastructure	S													
3.8	Brownfield inventory	S													
3.9	Education facilities	S													
3.10	Housing needs assessment	S													
3.11	Agriculture conditions	S													
3.12	Food system (production and processing)	S													
3.13	Health (key public health issues and indicators)	S													
3.14	Policy inventory	TP/S													
3.15	Transportation plans	TR													
3.16	Comprehensive plans	TR													
3.17	Air quality/environmental plans	TR													
3.18	Emergency services (safety /security) plans	TR													
3.19	Housing plans	S													
3.20	Economic development plans	S													
3.21	Community infrastructure plans	S													
<b>Direction and Issues</b>															
<b>4. Trend Analysis</b>															
4.1	Regional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats	S													
4.2	Trend analysis	S													
4.3	Projected transportation demand	TR													
4.4	Public involvement	TR													
<b>Where We Want to Be</b>															
<b>5. Visioning</b>															
5.1	Planning assumptions (future growth, land use, travel patterns, employment, congestion, economic activity)	TR													
5.2	Scenario planning	TP													
5.3	General regional vision for the future	TP/S													
5.4	Capital investment and other strategies to preserve infrastructure for future needs	TR/S													
5.5	Online review of growth scenario	TP													
5.6	Public involvement	TR													
	<b>BOARD APPROVE REGIONAL GROWTH SCENARIO</b>						<b>Sep</b>								
Plan Elements		Jul 11 - Sep 11	Oct 11 - Dec 11	Jan 12 - Mar 12	Apr 12 - Jun 12	Jul 12 - Sep 12	Oct 12 - Dec 12	Jan 13 - Mar 13	Apr 13 - Jun 13	Jul 13 - Sep 13	Oct 13 - Dec 13	Jan 14 - Mar 14	Apr 14 - Jun 14	Jul 14 - Sep 14	Oct 14 - Dec 14

6. Additional data and studies														
6.1	Identification of data and policy gaps	S												
6.2	Research to fill data gaps	S												
6.3	Economic modeling of benefits of infrastructure enhancements and policy implementation	TP												
6.4	Operational and management strategies	TR												
6.5	Congestion management process	TR												
6.6	Alternative transportation (transit, bike, pedestrian, enhancements)	TR												
6.7	Description of proposed (transportation) facilities	TR												
	<b>BOARD APPROVE PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA</b>													
	<b>BOARD APPROVE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP and REGIONAL CORRIDORS</b>													
6.8	Operations/ITS plan update	TP												
6.9	Potential environmental mitigation activities	TR												
7. Prepare the plan														
7.1	Federally required and regionally significant elements	TR/S												
7.2	Transportation financial plan/forecast and project cost estimates	TR												
	<b>BOARD APPROVE FINANCIAL FORECAST</b>													
	<b>BOARD APPROVE FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINT FUNDED LIST</b>													
7.3	Financial plan for how (other) plan elements can be implemented	S												
7.4	Air quality conformity determination	TR												
7.5	Public involvement (review of draft plan)	TR												
7.6	Printing/distribution	TR												
7.7	Technical Writer	TP/S												
Getting Where We Want to Be														
8. Implementation														
8.1	Re-energize leadership team	S/TP												
8.2	<b>BOARD ADOPT PLAN</b>	TR												
8.3	Aligning policies (based on findings in Task 3)	S/TP												
8.4	Community strategies for plan implementation	S/TP												
8.5	Mini-grant program	TP												
8.6	Partnerships to facilitate implementation	S												
8.7	Performance measures	S/TP												
8.8	Tracking and monitoring of implementation	S/TP												
8.9	Community and public involvement	S/TP												
8.10	Framework for updating the plan	TR												

TR = Transportation Required  
TP = Transportation Proposed  
S = Sustainability