



REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 24, 2008
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

****MINUTES****

ATTENDEES:

Mary Barker, Valley Regional Transit
 Joe Barton, Nampa Highway District #1 (*for Jim Buffington*)
 Clair Bowman, City of Nampa
 Sabrina Bowman, Ada County Highway District
 LeAnn Carlsen, Joint School District #2
 Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation
 Phil Choate, Idaho Transportation Department-District 3
 Matt Ellsworth, City of Meridian, *Chair*
 Jim Farrens, Ada County Development Services
 Steve Hasson, City of Kuna
 Ryan McDaniel, City of Boise
 Deanna Smith, Public Participation Committee
 Sarah Stobaugh, Boise Independent School District
 Jenah Thornborrow, City of Garden City
 Toni Tisdale, COMPASS (*Ex-Officio*)
 Jarom Wagoner, Canyon County Development Services

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Brad Broker, Department of Environmental Quality
 Jared Everett, Boise State University
 Anne Horn, Mayor, City of Notus
 Rob Howarth, Central District Health Department (*Ex-Officio*)
 Wendy Howell, City of Middleton
 Brent Orton, City of Caldwell
 Tim Richard, Canyon Highway District #4, *Vice Chair*
 Mary Shaw Taylor, City of Star
 Margie Watson, Mayor, City of Parma

OTHERS PRESENT:

Andrew Cibor, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
 Ross Dodge, COMPASS
 Sonna Lynn Fernandez, Idaho Transportation Department
 Liisa Itkonen, COMPASS
 Carl Miller, COMPASS
 Sai Kumar Sarepalli, Holladay Engineering Company
 Charles Trainor, COMPASS
 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 Ellsworth called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

Toni Tisdale stated that Capital City Development Corporation staff has requested that a discussion item be added to the agenda regarding the Ada County Highway District's (ACHD) Complete Streets Policy.

OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve August 27, 2008 Meeting Agenda

Clair Bowman moved and Jon Cecil seconded to approve the August 27, 2008 meeting minutes as written. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Recommend Regional Mirroring Changes for FY2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Toni Tisdale presented the final regional mirroring changes to the FY2009-2013 TIP for recommendation to the COMPASS Board.

Clair Bowman referred to Key Number 10915, I-84, Garrity Interchange to Franklin Interchange; this is a Garrity Interchange rebuild and the total project amount is shown as \$1.57 million which includes construction.

Toni replied that this project has additional FY2008 or FY2009 funds but she will check to confirm the most recent update for this project. Clair stated that the \$1.57 million would not cover a rebuild of this project.

After discussion, Sabrina Bowman moved and Clair Bowman seconded to recommend mirroring changes for FY2009-2013 Regional Transportation Improvement Program as indicated in the staff report handout. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

At this time, introductions were made of all attendees.

*B. Recommend Approval of the 2008 **Communities in Motion** (CIM) Performance Monitoring Report*

Carl Miller presented the 2008 CIM Performance Monitoring Report for recommendation to the COMPASS Board.

Discussion:

- Why are standing baselines not included on city limit sidewalks? ACHD staff will check their GIS data. Is there interest in tracking bike lanes?

Carl commented that bike lane data has been reported in the past but no real progress has been made to continue tracking this data and therefore it was not included in this report.

- Bike lane data has had considerable change within Boise and Meridian. Is there an interest in continuing to track this information for the *Communities in Motion* update?

Charles Trainor replied this would be an issue in the area for improving data; data cannot be obtained from just one source. Because this is a regional report, the same information must be obtained from Canyon County, cities, and highway districts. Even though there may not be a significant number of bike lanes, it should be tracked.

- This may be a good item to present to the Regional Geographic Advisory Committee (RGAC); how the data can be integrated into future reports.
- Under the City of Middleton, Choices in Transportation: the report states that there are no transit routes in 2007. There is a transit route that goes to Middleton, which is the same route shown in the City of Eagle and the City of Star in 2007.
- How are lot supplies determined in Table 14: Outstanding Preliminary Plats as of December 2007?

Charles replied that in order to acquire the vacant lot supply, Eric Adolfson has automated a process by which he can look at the subdivision private lots and remove the lots that show no building or improved values.

- There is no reflection for ordinances that would allow infill and density; only underlying zoning lots.
- In Table 14, Canyon Unincorporated: the number of Preliminary Plats looks a little high, double check that data.

Charles replied that COMPASS staff is dependent upon the supply of information from member agencies which highlights another issue when tracking accumulative development: the variation of data received and receiving updated information.

- Table 14, Outstanding Preliminary Plats as of December 2007 by City and County Agencies, is confusing. The data indicates preliminary plats outside of the Meridian Area of Impact. If the intent of the table is to illustrate dispersion of growth, it should have a footnote that indicates that those preliminary plats are within another city's area of impact or that it has been requested by Meridian to amend the area of impact boundaries. Would it be appropriate to identify the platted acres with any area of impact or only within that relevant jurisdiction's area of city impact?
- From *Blueprint for Good Growth's* perspective, there should be some indication that something is or is not inside the area of impact. From the perspective of public facilities, there should be some indication as to whether a city is going to adequately supply those areas. Is there a way to show both? It is dependent on what is being measured.
- The purpose of this report is to track and monitor the growth toward the CIM goals. To add more data to this table would cause confusion.
- If complete data is not stated, it could be misinterpreted. Perhaps language should be added in the area of impact indicating the different scenarios.
- Each jurisdiction is going to approach the area of impact and how much weight it carries in different ways. To add a column in addition to the Preliminary Acres indicating how many acres are outside the area of city impact at the time of adoption of CIM would be helpful. If that is the direction taken, also include a footnote on the acreage for Meridian indicating that all of those

acres are within an area that has been planned and subject to an active application which has been presented to the county; pending discussion between the city and county.

- Because information is missing from this report and additional changes are going to be made, the report should go back to the member agencies' policy makers for review before it is recommended by RTAC and presented to the COMPASS Board.
- The report is missing the financial implications of what is not occurring with regard to CIM; not just from the transportation perspective but also with what is happening with the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO), which is tied in closely with CIM.
- Data is needed regarding the sub-area studies (i.e., Northwest Foothills, South Boise, City of Meridian's study last year) and even though the Transportation Land Use Implementation Plan (TLIP) was mentioned, it does not explain what it did or is supposed to be doing.

Charles replied that this document has already gotten much larger than was originally envisioned at the offset. The original intent was to provide a sense to RTAC, COMPASS Board, and the public as to the tracking of growth and the progression of broad issues envisioned in the plan. As the document gets larger, the opportunities and likelihood that people will actually read it declines. Perhaps too much data is irrelevant and if there is data that is more relevant, COMPASS staff should be made aware of these changes. To retain all this information and add to it may be counter productive for its purpose.

Carl commented that though the report could be approved by adding additional data, the Regional Geographic Advisory Committee (RGAC) has been meeting for over a year just to work on those issues. On several occasions COMPASS' assistant planners have requested qualitative data from the cities and counties regarding sub-area plans.

- If there is a benefit to add additional information to this report, a recommendation for RTAC to consider: rather than updating the report annually, update it every three years which would show a more notable change in year to year outputs for comparison purposes and would free up staff time to work on other projects in those interim years.
- The data incorporated into this report is what COMPASS staff requests and what is received from the cities; if data is not received, there is nothing to report. This report is low on the priority list compared to other projects that require COMPASS staff time.
- Since the document is mostly complete, perhaps it should be presented to the COMPASS Board with minor modifications. In order to take on a meaningful narrative in addition to the facts and figures contained therein, a separate meeting could be scheduled to strip down this report, determine the usable portions, and add a normative component from a COMPASS staff perspective of who is following the regional plan.

Chair Ellsworth summarized the discussion: one issue is the reporting of information and working with the cities to make sure data is given to COMPASS staff in order to produce a meaningful update year after year and an additional issue is the frequency with which the report is updated, which would require an amendment to CIM.

Charles replied that CIM calls for an annual report. The document was intended to be a "high-level report card" on how the vision of the plan is being implemented and then to feed back into the process, what will be done if it's not happening the way it was originally envisioned. It is intended to hopefully influence policy, which is only going to happen if it is read.

Chair Ellsworth suggested the committee give Carl direction to: move forward with the adjustments discussed; request a future RTAC agenda item to discuss the possibility of an amendment to CIM to space

out the frequency that these updates occur; to revisit what information will be included in those future updates; as well as the related discussion regarding exchanging data between the cities and COMPASS.

- The creation of an Executive Summary to the report summarizing this discussion would be helpful without having to create 100 pages of data.
- A policy initiative summary is missing from this document. CIM has been lost in the magnitude of this report.

*Ryan McDaniel moved and Deanna Smith seconded to recommend the approval of the **Communities in Motion** Preference Monitoring Report with the changes discussed and with the understanding that RTAC will form a subcommittee to review the content of this report.*

Discussion:

- Does the “changes discussed” (minor or major) include adding an Executive Summary?

Ryan replied that the motion does not include the addition of an Executive Summary: the changes being footnotes with no structural changes to the Table of Contents.

After further discussion, Chair Ellsworth stated that it is unclear whether the original motion included the formation of a subcommittee or indicated that RTAC will revisit the issues next month. Chair Ellsworth stated he would be more comfortable revisiting some issues next month rather than committing to an additional subcommittee at this time.

Clair Bowman stated that a lot of questions have been raised and there seems to be no urgency to move it forward.

Clair Bowman made a substitute motion, seconded by Phil Choate, to table this item and allow staff to present a recommendation to RTAC next month either from a subcommittee of RTAC or a staff recommendation as to how to proceed.

Discussion:

Ryan McDaniel stated that he probably would not use this document within the next 30 days but concurred with Sabrina Bowman’s comments for the need to create a viable transportation planning document. The Performance Monitoring Report has the potential to be a useful planning tool and a reasonable Executive Summary cannot be created that would address all of these meaningful points. Ryan commented that he would join Sabrina in a subcommittee to determine what information is meaningful.

Phil Choate commented that if substantive progress is being made, this is something that needs to be communicated to the public not just to the elected officials.

There being no further discussion, the substitute motion passes with fourteen ayes and four nays.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Review Transportation Financial Report

Charles Trainor presented the revenue and expenditures trend report, which was prepared under *Communities in Motion*.

Discussion:

- Time series is always valuable. Regarding reconstruction, it may be helpful to add a footnote indicating that there is some masked expansion or improvement in the reconstruction figures.

Charles asked if breaking out the sources of revenue by each county would be advantageous.

- It would be advantageous. There are different funding mechanisms and diversity in funding sources one county to the next and understanding those differences would be beneficial.
- Since this report will go before the COMPASS Board and will be used in public meetings, perhaps simplicity is key. It may be better to include this additional information in an appendix.
- What is the timeline for this report?

Charles replied that the report will come back to RTAC next month and will be presented to the COMPASS Board in November 2008.

- Under Transit Trips and Service Provided, it is important to include how public transit funding is obtained.

Charles replied that he would include the various means of funding.

Chair Ellsworth requested that additional questions, comments, and concerns be forwarded to Charles.

B. Discussion regarding Updates to the Functional Classification System

Toni Tisdale presented an update to the functional classification of roadways, as requested by ACHD staff. Toni commented that she is in the process of creating a protocol for functional classification updates and requested the committee's feedback.

Discussion:

- It would be more beneficial to the smaller agencies if the Regional Long-Range Plan "Official" and "Unofficial" update occurred more frequently.
- Change "Unofficial" to "Planning Map."
- An annual update would be beneficial with an early November deadline.

C. Review the Transportation Improvement Program Project Prioritization Process

Toni Tisdale reviewed the draft Project Prioritization Process document and options regarding possible policy for maintenance issues.

Chair Ellsworth expressed his appreciation to the subcommittee for all their work on this process.

Discussion:

Ryan McDaniel stated that the most favorable aspects of the proposal are: the highest priority is the number on the top-left corner of the prioritization scorecard and projects are presented in a “silo” effect with each project listed in order of the scoring outcome. The least favorable aspect is with regard to the complete project application for growth areas. There should be a higher weight on growth areas.

Jenah Thornborrow commented that it is vitally important that there be high ranking with regard to the growth areas.

Clair Bowman stated that it should not be all or nothing because you are dealing with a very small portion of available urban funds. The urban funds are generally seen as being under the guidance and control of the individual agencies who apply for them. High priority projects can score well and if they are necessary, should be funded.

Chair Ellsworth commented that this area is strapped financially for the needed transportation improvements. If a need is being created outside of a growth area, whatever is creating that need should find a way for it to be funded.

Sabrina Bowman stated that from a constructability standpoint, we need to realize how the construction process works. Sabrina commented that she does not like having only \$506,000 for major capital unless it is used only for planning projects as referenced in Option 2: Table 2. Sabrina suggested that instead of leaving money on the table for capital projects, move those funds to the “Public Transportation” category, label that category to read “Multi-Modal” and add public transportation into the descriptor, which would allow more money for construction.

Chair Ellsworth recommended that the committee review the report with the understanding that this item will come back to RTAC in October as an Action Item.

D. Discuss Construction and Studies Coordination

Chair Ellsworth stated that in the interest of time, this item will be tabled until the next scheduled meeting.

E. Complete Streets Policy

Sabrina Bowman presented the Ada County Highway District’s Complete Streets Policy.

Chair Ellsworth requested an outline or general overview of the component products of TLIP, for clarification purposes.

Sabrina replied that ACHD is working on a rollout schedule of the TLIP projects.

Jon Cecil expressed his appreciation of ACHD’s consideration and promotion of a Complete Streets Policy. Jon asked why this particular policy was not directed to RTAC for review, comment, and recommendation.

Sabrina replied that the policy was directed to the cities, council staff, neighborhood associations, and the alliance rather than to RTAC and COMPASS Board as a regional and multi-county body.

Jon stated that the Capital City Development Corporation was not on the initial distribution. Jon commented that because of ACHD’s unique role with streets in the county, this is more of a regional issue and RTAC should have a say in what this policy is recommending for the region.

Charles Trainor replied that that decision is up to RTAC.

After discussion, Chair Ellsworth asked if RTAC would like to review this document and forward a recommendation to the COMPASS Board in order for the Board to provide their input into ACHD's process.

Jon Cecil suggested that the member agencies from Canyon County consider a Complete Street Policy as well.

Charles Trainor replied that what is being sought from this discussion is not a COMPASS Board response to ACHD, but rather a separate action that would request the Board to endorse these principles regionally. Jon Cecil concurred.

After further discussion, Jon Cecil moved and Ryan McDaniel seconded that RTAC present to the COMPASS Board a letter in support of the Complete Streets Policy from a regional perspective.

Discussion:

Clair Bowman stated that he has no knowledge of, nor has he had a chance to review this policy and feels uncomfortable forwarding a recommendation to the COMPASS Board.

Chair Ellsworth asked if there was further discussion on the motion. Hearing none, Chair Ellsworth requested a vote on the motion.

There being no further discussion on the motion, *the motion fails with 3 ayes and 8 nays.*

Charles commented that if this is for broader regional consideration and not intended to convey information to ACHD by October 9, 2008; then this item could come back to RTAC to consider a more general nature of complete streets, not specific to ACHD's policy. *The committee concurred.*

Sabrina Bowman requested that individual member comments regarding the Complete Street Policy be forwarded to her prior to the close of the public comment period on October 9, 2008.

OTHER

Toni Tisdale stated that the Access Management Tool was approved by the COMPASS Board and has been posted to the COMPASS website.

A. *Next Meeting:* Wednesday, October 22, 2008, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.