

*REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE*  
*MARCH 25, 2009*  
*COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION*

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

- ATTENDEES:*
- Troy Behunin, City of Kuna (*for Steve Hasson*)
  - Clair Bowman, City of Nampa
  - Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation
  - Phil Choate, Idaho Transportation Department-District 3
  - Ryan Cutler, Ada County Highway District (*for Gary Inselman*)
  - Stephen Freiburger, Nampa Highway District #1 (*for Jim Buffington*)
  - Margaret Havey, Valley Regional Transit (*for Mary Barker*)
  - Caleb Hood, City of Meridian
  - Rob Howarth, Central District Health Department (*Ex-Officio*)
  - Wendy Howell, City of Middleton
  - Jeff Lowe, City of Eagle
  - David Luft, Department of Environmental Quality
  - Ryan McDaniel, City of Boise
  - Brent Orton, City of Caldwell, *Chair*
  - Jenah Thornborrow, City of Garden City
  - Toni Tisdale, COMPASS (*Ex-Officio*)
  - Leslie Toombs, Ada County Highway District (*for Sabrina Anderson*)
  - Jim Voorhees, Canyon Highway District #4
  - Kelly Woodworth, Ada County Development Services (*for Jim Farrens*)
- MEMBERS ABSENT:*
- LeAnn Carlsen, Joint School District #2
  - Jared Everett, Boise State University
  - Anne Horn, Mayor, City of Notus
  - Deanna Smith, Public Participation Committee
  - Sarah Stobaugh, Boise Independent School District
  - Mary Shaw Taylor, City of Star
  - Jarom Wagoner, Canyon County Development Services
  - Margie Watson, Mayor, City of Parma
- OTHERS PRESENT:*
- Eric Lindstrom, Kittelson & Associates
  - Carl Miller, COMPASS
  - Megan Rush, Ada County Development Services
  - Sai Kumar Sarepalli, Holladay Engineering Company
  - Charles Trainor, COMPASS
  - MaryAnn Waldinger, COMPASS
  - Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

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

*CALL TO ORDER*

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

Introductions were made of all attendees.

*AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES*

Jon Cecil requested that Carl Miller give a 5-minute update regarding the progress made to date on the Complete Streets Policy.

Stephen Freiburger stated it was his understanding after talking to Sabrina Anderson that the Overview of the McDermott Road Study would be presented after issues were resolved with the Ada County Highway District. Stephen requested that this item be taken off the agenda and tabled until the next scheduled meeting.

Stephen Freiburger stated he had one comment regarding the February 25, 2009 minutes.

*Stephen Freiburger moved and Clair Bowman seconded to remove approval of the February 25, 2009 meeting minutes from the Consent Agenda. Motion carries.*

*Stephen Freiburger moved and Clair Bowman seconded to add approval of the February 25, 2009 meeting minutes to the Action Items. Motion carries.*

*OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS*

MaryAnn Waldinger stated that at RTAC's February 2009 meeting, a quick overview was given regarding the air quality conformity demonstration process; at which time Clair Bowman raised an interesting question: once an inspection maintenance program is set up in Canyon County does it immediately put Canyon County under the requirement of performing the conformity determination. MaryAnn commented that based on the review of the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA), once an emissions testing program goes into affect in Canyon County, it does NOT immediately put Canyon County into the requirement of performing the conformity determination. Canyon County would have to be designated a nonattainment area for one of the criteria pollutants included in the monitoring data collected by the Department of Environmental Quality before conformity determinations are required.

Jon Cecil commented that legislation has been reintroduced in the House and Senate for a federal Complete Streets Bill. Jon also stated that the Environmental Protection Agency will be looking at the regulation of Carbon Dioxide and other global warming pollutants.

Carl Miller stated that RTAC's workgroup for the Complete Streets Policy has met several times and a draft policy will be presented to RTAC by spring 2009.

*ACTION ITEMS*

*A. Approve February 25, 2009 Meeting Minutes*

Stephen Freiburger requested that a minor modification be made on page 3, fifth paragraph: "Charles commented that this is not intended to be a regional **transit** plan...."

*Stephen Freiburger moved and Wendy Howell seconded to approve the February 25, 2008 meeting minutes as amended. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.*

*B. Election of Vice Chair*

*Stephen Freiburger nominated Jeff Lowe to serve as RTAC's Vice Chair. There being no other nominations, the nominations were closed. By unanimous consent, Jeff Lowe was elected to serve as RTAC's Vice Chair for 2009.*

*C. Recommend Approval to Amend the FY2009-2013 Regional Transportation Improvement Program*

Toni Tisdale stated this is to amend the "ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY" section of the FY2009-2013 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add a possible new economic Stimulus project. Toni commented that there was approximately \$875,000 left in District 3's funds for the Federal Transit Administration section 5311 transit money, due to a limited number of applications for these funds, which are for rural capital transit projects. COMPASS applied for \$250,000. Toni said that the District Coordination Council is recommending \$120,000 for COMPASS rather than the \$250,000, so the Amendment will be changed to reflect the recommended amounts. If approved through the Idaho Transportation Board, the project will move to the funded portion of the TIP with an Administrative Modification. The public is invited to comment on these projects between March 20 and April 3, 2009. RTAC's recommendation will be presented to the COMPASS Board in April 2009.

*Clair Bowman moved and Jon Cecil seconded to recommend approval to amend the FY2009-2013 Regional Transportation Improvement Program as presented. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.*

*D. Recommend Approval of Development Review Protocol*

Carl Miller stated that at the February 25, 2009 RTAC meeting, the role of COMPASS in providing review and written or verbal testimony regarding development applications was discussed. After a series of reviews by the subcommittee, a development review protocol was drafted by COMPASS staff for RTAC's review. Carl commented that one outstanding issue that needs resolution from the committee is the decision of who can make development review requests of COMPASS. The majority of comments received indicated that any agency could make a request of COMPASS regarding any other location (i.e., City A could make a request that COMPASS review an application that happens to be within the purview of City B). Minority opinion received indicated that it should only be the city with jurisdiction making the request.

*Discussion:*

- It is stated that technical evaluations will be done. Will the technical evaluations be done by an engineer or staff?

Carl replied that "technical review" meant that there would be no judging of whether or not the merits of an application should be approved; only information regarding traffic counts, the impact on functionally classified roads, the location, etc. and not an engineering review of the document.

- Bullet point #4: Strike all text except, "All developments are eligible for COMPASS staff to review upon member agency request." and make bullet 4, bullet 2.
- "...when requested by any member agency for any location whether inside or outside of the requesting agency's jurisdiction..." should be broadened beyond the agency to those who are directly impacted by the project.
- Is there any merit to COMPASS staff commenting on the traffic analysis zones and does this implement the *Communities in Motion* Trend or Community Choices scenarios?

- This is a public process and the public has the right to testify to most applications. COMPASS staff should choose whether they want to comment or not, not whether an agency decides whether or not to comment.
- There is a timeline concern and a timeframe needs to be established for the jurisdictions.

Charles Trainor commented that there have been times when COMPASS staff has not been requested to do a review by the lead agency and had the request made by another agency. There is a good reason to do so when the project is of magnitude. This protocol is attempting to set some raw thresholds, not trying to exclude it and nail it down to every instance but to give staff guidance on when to get involved and under what circumstances.

Clair Bowman summarized the discussion:

- Bullet 1 should stay #1 and worded as is.
- What is currently bullet 4 should become bullet 2: "All developments are eligible for COMPASS staff to review upon member agency request."
- What is now the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet, needs modification:
  - Substitute that COMPASS will review it but there is some discretion if the Traffic Impact Studies' (TIS) thresholds are not met. The TIS threshold could be used as the basis for screening out smaller projects that cannot be reviewed, or aren't reviewed, and for identifying the legitimate member agencies who could request it. COMPASS should also be able to deny a request.

Wendy Howell commented that everyone is making this too difficult; this is a simple document. In the 8<sup>th</sup> bullet it states that: "COMPASS will copy development review letters to affected agencies such as highway districts, cities, counties, and Idaho Transportation Department as appropriate." If they meet a certain threshold, the lead agency should be the one that makes the call and the other agencies will be copied on it. If there needs to be communication, it should have already taken place.

*Ryan McDaniel moved Jon Cecil seconded to recommend approval of the Development Review Protocol with the following changes: Bullet 1 should stay #1 and worded as is and amend the text in bullet 6, 1<sup>st</sup> subparagraph to read: "Size, location, and type of development, background traffic, and functional classification of affected roadways, **capacity within the Communities in Motion growth scenarios (i.e. 'Community Choices' and 'Trend')**."*

*Discussion:*

Caleb commented if the lead agency requested that COMPASS should provide a comment, there is a reason they are asking COMPASS for their review. If an outside agency is requesting, they should have veto power.

Charles replied that staff needs the ability to say "no" at times when appropriate; however, all those circumstances cannot be defined in this document.

*After further discussion, Clair Bowman made a substitute motion and Jim Voorhees seconded to direct staff to prepare a revision to the document and bring it back to RTAC for action at the next meeting, specifically including the items stated in the original motion as well as a clarified guideline for who can request a development review – something greater than the responsible agency and less than the entire COMPASS membership.*

*Discussion:*

Stephen stated that under the circumstances this is the best scenario because he is opposed to this document in its basic form and most of the discussion has been centered on Traffic Impact Studies which have already been addressed.

There being no further discussion, *the motion carries with five nay votes.*

*E. Recommend Approval of Draft Purpose and Need Statement for the High Priority Corridor/Establish a Subcommittee*

Charles Trainor stated a background document was presented to RTAC in February 2009 and after discussion it was RTAC's recommendation to defer further discussion until the March 2009 meeting. Charles commented that this document was also discussed at a workshop on March 10, 2009 where John Cullerton of URS, the author of the report, was in attendance. Discussion topics were: review of the report, expected future work, and key recommendations/dates which will come before RTAC over the next several months. John provided a draft Purpose and Need Statement which has been presented to this committee for review and recommendation. Charles also requested that a subcommittee be established to review future products.

Stephen Freiburger stated that in the second paragraph, second sentence, the word "forecast" should be changed to "forecasted."

After discussion, *Stephen Freiburger moved and Clair Bowman seconded to approve the Project Purpose Statement but the Needs Statement requires more work.*

*Discussion:*

Jon Cecil stated he was opposed to the motion because under the present timeline, going through these changes will entail unnecessary delay. Jon said the needs are identified and proposed accepting the Purpose and Needs Statement as submitted, recommend it be forwarded back to the consultant, and organize the subcommittee.

*Jon Cecil made a substitute motion and seconded by Wendy Howell to accept the Purpose and Needs Statement as submitted by staff and establish a subcommittee.*

*Discussion:*

Stephen was opposed to the substitute motion because time should not be a factor. Stephen said he would support the substitute motion as long as the subcommittee is established and in the future these details are worked out before it is presented to RTAC.

Jon replied that the subcommittee was not put into place at the time of initial discussion of this document with John Cullerton. Jon agreed that the subcommittee needs to be organized and on a schedule to start working with URS.

There being no further discussion, *the substitute motion carries.*

Draft list of subcommittee names presented:

Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation  
Clair Bowman, City of Nampa  
Stephen Freiburger, Paragon Engineers, Inc.  
Brent Orton, City of Caldwell  
Jarmon Wagoner, Canyon County

Jenah Thornborrow, Garden City

Phil Choate, ITD District 3

Matt Ellsworth, City of Meridian

Representatives from the Ada County Highway District and Valley Regional Transit to be announced

Charles stated he would send RTAC a complete list of the subcommittee participants.

#### *INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS*

##### *A. Overview of the Idaho 16 Project*

Phil Choate presented the status of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Idaho 16. The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) is examining a corridor between I-84 and the junction of Idaho 44 and Idaho 16 for a potential new roadway. The EIS and preferred alternative(s) will be available for review prior to the public hearing that is anticipated in spring 2009. A Record of Decision (ROD), to be issued by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is expected in April 2010. The administrative draft of the EIS is under review by FHWA and is expected to be completed by May 2009. Pending satisfactory completion of the legal sufficiency of the document, ITD will ask FHWA for the financial approval to allow ITD to do some emergency right-of-way acquisitions, primarily in the City of Star area. Assuming a ROD is approved by April 2010, the approval of additional bonding authority from the State Legislature will have to be put in place to enable a construction project to move forward. ITD has no authority to extend the southern terminus of the project beyond the Interstate. Ada County Highway District (ACHD) staff shared that the preferred alignment recommended by ACHD is Alternate of D.

##### *B. Overview of the McDermott Road Study*

This item was tabled until the March 2009 meeting.

##### *C. Update on the Revised Ada County Community Ordinance*

Megan Rush presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding Ada County Planned Community Zoning Ordinance Amendments that included:

- Summary of Application Steps
- Step 1 – Sub Area Comprehensive Plan
- Step 2 – Implementation Plan
- Step 3 – Preliminary Plan
- Step 4 – Grading
- Steps 5 & 6 – Final Plat & Building Permits

After discussion, Megan commented that RTAC members are welcome to contact her if they have any questions: (208) 287-5715 or [mrush@adaweb.net](mailto:mrush@adaweb.net).

##### *D. Review **Communities in Motion** Implementation Guidebook*

Carl Miller presented a PowerPoint overview of the *Communities in Motion* Implementation Guidebook. Carl commented that copies of the Guidebook will be distributed at RTAC's next scheduled meeting, as well as to the stakeholders involved in the development of the Guidebook.

##### *E. Review the New Project Prioritization Process*

Toni Tisdale presented an update on the progress of amendments to the project prioritization process. Toni stated that once additional guidance is provided by the COMPASS Executive Committee and Board,

staff will reconvene the subcommittee to finalize the prioritization document. The subcommittee is expected to reconvene in late-April 2009.

Ryan McDaniel expressed his appreciation to Toni for all the work she has put into this process. Ryan said he will create a document stating the background of this undertaking, previous RTAC Minutes, discussions, and a summary of the key issues; from which, he will create a numbered list that will be given to the RTAC representatives so that everyone has the same information to share. Ryan suggested this may be something that should be coordinated among other members of the RTAC subcommittee. Ryan said he would send his list to Toni for review and revision.

Toni stated that she will build a history as well and an outline will be forwarded to this committee before it is presented to the COMPASS Executive Committee and Board.

*OTHER*

A. *Next Meeting:* Wednesday, April 22, 2009, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

*ADJOURNMENT*

*There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.*

T:\FY09\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RTAC\Minutes\minutes032509.docx