



REGIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 26, 2007
COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSOCIATION

****MINUTES****

- ATTENDEES:*
- Mary Berent, City of Middleton, *Chair*
 - Wendell Bigham, Joint School District #2
 - Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation
 - Michael DuBois, Department of Environmental Quality
 - Matt Ellsworth, City of Meridian, *Vice Chair*
 - Michael Fuss, City of Nampa
 - Karen Gallagher, City of Boise
 - Dean Gunderson, Ada County Development Services
 - Steve Hasson, City of Kuna
 - Shawn Martin, Ada County Highway District
 - Andrew O'Conner, Ada County Highway District (*for Don Kostelec*)
 - Brent Orton, City of Caldwell
 - Whitney Rearick, Boise State University
 - Tim Richard, Canyon Highway District #4
 - Nichoel Baird Spencer, City of Eagle
 - Sarah Stobaugh, Boise Independent School District
 - Jenah Thornborrow, City of Garden City
 - Toni Tisdale, COMPASS (*Ex-Officio*)
 - Jarom Wagoner, Canyon County Development Services
 - Mark Wasdahl, Idaho Transportation Department-District 3 (*for Phil Choate*)
- MEMBERS ABSENT:*
- Jim Buffington, Nampa Highway District #1
 - Ester Ceja, Public Participation Committee
 - Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
 - Anne Horn, Mayor, City of Notus
 - Rob Howarth, Central District Health Department (*Ex-Officio*)
 - Mary Shaw Taylor, City of Star
 - Margie Watson, Mayor, City of Parma
- OTHERS PRESENT:*
- Pete Friedman, City of Meridian
 - Don Matson, COMPASS
 - Ryan McDaniel, City of Boise
 - Carl Miller, COMPASS
 - Terri Schorzman, COMPASS
 - 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 Berent called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

None.

OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Toni Tisdale distributed page 1 of Item VI-A, Status Report – Current Transportation Project Information, which contains the most recent reported statics for the Boise Air Terminal.

Dean Gunderson stated that Ada County Development Services' staff met with the Department of Commerce and Labor, the Governor's Military Division, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Department of Defense. The State of Idaho submitted for a Department of Defense grant to conduct a Joint Land Use Study to help rural communities surrounding military bases undergoing base realignment. The federal government requested that Gowen Field be included in the study. The budget was adjusted for a two-year long, two-county study similar to *Communities in Motion* in its scope, which will have an impact on transportation issues requiring compliance with federal studies. Gloria Mabbutt of the Department of Commerce and Labor's Rural & Community Development Division will be the grant manager. Gloria's contact information is: gloria.mabbutt@community.idaho.gov and (208) 334-2650 x2139.

Introductions were made of all attendees.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approve August 22, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Dean Gunderson moved and Nichoel Baird Spencer seconded to approve the August 22, 2007 meeting minutes as written. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Recommend Approval of Communities in Motion (CIM) Performance Monitoring Report

Charles Trainor presented for recommendation to the COMPASS Board, the *Communities in Motion* (CIM) Performance Monitoring Report.

Discussion Summarized:

- Open space and farmland:
 - What is the role of cities and counties in preserving farmland?
 - Should preservation of farmland within areas of impact be a concern?
 - What is the role of open space and how is open space defined?
- Choices in housing:
 - When considering housing choices, what is the importance of housing affordability when considering diversity of housing?
 - What is the difference between subsidized housing for low income and workforce housing?
 - Why and how should transportation costs factor into housing costs?

- Connectivity:
 - What does connectivity mean?
 - What is the difference between regional, community, and neighborhood connectivity?
 - How do these relate to transportation and land use decisions?
 - A clear understanding of definitional issues is needed from the Board. What does the Board want to measure?

- Growth:
 - What are the best levels— city, demographic area, traffic analysis zone—for considering variations between projected growth and actual growth? Should short-term trends drive long-term decisions?
 - What is the potential that transportation and other costs will stimulate in-fill?
 - Is fixing the areas of impact at their 2006 level a reasonable approach for measuring growth?

Nichoel Baird Spencer commented that a clear understanding is needed from Board, as to some of the definitional issues. From this discussion, several had different understandings on what was being measured when addressing connectivity. What does the Board want to measure?

Charles Trainor stated that these questions will be assembled and a recommendation to approve the *Communities in Motion* Performance Monitoring Report will not go forth at this time.

B. Recommend Approval of Mirroring Changes to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Programs

Toni Tisdale presented changes to the final state programs that occurred through the mirroring process. Key Number 10796 is a transit project that has been pulled from the list which was previously distributed to the committee.

Discussion:

- Key No. 10549, I-84, Garrity Interchange to Meridian Interchange, delete the word "reduced" from the sentence, "This reduced amount remains for development of overall project."

After discussion, *Brent Orton moved and Dean Gunderson seconded to recommend approval of mirroring changes to the FY 2008-2012 Transportation Improvement Programs as amended. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.*

C. Recommend Proposed Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Policy

Toni Tisdale presented a proposal to streamline Transportation Improvement Program amendments.

After discussion, *Karen Gallagher moved and Tim Richard seconded to recommend the proposed Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Policy with amended changes:*

- Administrative Modifications, Components – amend 4th bullet to read: "Add new bridge replacement or rehabilitation project with bridge funds (*safety or rehabilitation*)."
- Administrative Modifications – Components – amend 3rd bullet to read: "Change in dollar amount less than **20%** of total project cost **or \$2 million, whichever is less.**"
- Major Amendment – Components – amend 4th bullet to read: "Change in dollar amount in excess of **20%** of total project cost **or \$2 million, whichever is less.**"

- Administrative Modifications, Other Considerations – add “ *via email to all RTAC members who will have one week to reply prior to approval.*”

There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

D. Recommend Eagle Road Addition to Communities in Motion (CIM)

Charles Trainor presented information regarding upcoming *Communities in Motion* (CIM) and Transportation Improvement Program amendments to include the Eagle Road project financed with State Tax Anticipated Revenue (STAR). Contrary to the agenda action requested to recommend the Eagle Road Addition, RTAC is not requested to make a recommendation at this time. A recommendation will, however, be requested at the October 2007 RTAC meeting.

Discussion:

- It can be said that the amendment is in compliance with air quality because it is the only amendment being addressed, but when looking at other changes, they are being looked at in an accumulative process. Are we being short-sighted in the overall impacts of other decisions being made throughout the region?

Charles replied: The land uses being considered under CenterCal are consistent with what was shown under the Growth Scenario. The land use contemplated for that corner was mixed-use. The reason Eagle Road was not included was that at that time the state plan of record did not envision any major widening to Eagle Road but simply operational changes. If this project was to go forward, it could not be done without it being consistent with the plan.

- Need clarification of the process so that if others want to use process, it can be used uniformly. An amendment process must be established for CIM. Policy is being set by the use of this process.

Charles replied: When discussed with the Executive Committee, acknowledgement was made that the amendment would be consistent with land use and it is revenue neutral.

- If amendments are adopted then the impacts of those projects would be rolled back into the environmental considerations. When adding the expansion to capacity on Eagle Road it will decrease the gap for the next projects.
- Accumulative impact needs to be addressed through this process. What happens to those projects that are not consistent with CIM?
- Comprehensive Plans are living documents that are going to change. How will they be included in the long-range transportation plan? A clear process is needed as to why this process works.

Pete Friedman replied: If this process is successful, it will be a model that is going to be used in other communities. If the project is not currently within the long-range transportation plan, these issues will arise.

- Will Eagle Road widening include the previously proposed medians? If Eagle Road is widened to seven lanes, it would be a mistake not to include medians.

Pete Friedman replied: Meridian administration has made it clear that on the project frontage there is an expectation that there will be medians. Whether the medians to the south are in place, it is still subject to the engineering review by the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) project component.

Charles added: During discussions with Steve Hutchinson, Chief Engineer at ITD, Steve was emphatic that medians would be included in access management as envisioned.

Charles stated that RTAC is requested to make a recommendation of the PROCESS to add Eagle Road widening, which will come back to RTAC for approval based on public comments in October 2007.

Dean Gunderson moved and Matt Ellsworth seconded to recommend the process to add Eagle Road widening to CIM.

Discussion:

- Half of the estimated \$25,000 to process the amendment would be paid by CenterCal. How was that amount arrived at and why not 100%?

Charles replied: It was a policy decision that was approved by the Executive Committee and the remaining sum would be paid by COMPASSS monies.

- There has been no acknowledgement that an amendment process would be developed.

Charles replied: An amendment to the stated motion could stipulate that an amendment process should be developed soon. A discussion of the amendment process would then be added as a discussion item for the next scheduled meeting.

Chair Berent asked if committee was ready for the question to recommend the process to add Eagle Road widening to CIM, or if there are any amendments to the motion.

Dean Gunderson, as maker of the motion, acknowledged the need to address modifications or the additions of new projects into CIM that are consistent with the land use scenario as well as those not consistent, but this particular project has been presented.

Michael Fuss commented that a base framework has been discussed based on Charles' recommendations that what is stated is consistent with the land use scenario and that it is revenue neutral.

Nichoel Baird Spencer added that a funding assumption has also been presented as stated; it was a policy decision that was approved by the Executive Committee that half of the estimated \$25,000 to process the amendment would be paid by CenterCal and the remaining sum would be paid by COMPASSS monies.

There being no further discussion, *the motion was unanimously approved.*

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Review RTAC Bylaws

Toni Tisdale stated that because discussion of this item is not a pressing issue and because of the time constraints of this meeting, this item may be tabled for the next scheduled meeting.

B. Review Forecasting Methods

Carl Miller presented an overview of forecasting methods.

Discussion:

- The reason for going through this process was to recommend a couple of forecasting options to the COMPASS Board. There is a concern that several are using a build-out analysis but we're looking at six months before COMPASS will use the build-out analysis. Are we not going to make a recommendation to the Board for six months until that information is received and it is compared to what has been used?

Carl replied: John Church's forecast has a horizon year of 2040 and any build-out would be beyond the horizon date. A forecast would still be appropriate even if an ultimate build-out scenario was not already in place.

- The reason for this process is to look at alternatives. When looking at growth and doing population forecasting, there are official parameters but we are also looking at outside parameters. If when going to the Board we do not have those forecasts in hand, the Board is not receiving a tool that can be adequately used. Without seeing those numbers and gauging how they fall into chronological order as moving forward, it's hard to know what we are recommending to the Board.
- Regarding retirement/self-employment, Phoenix and Salt Lake developed employment. Is this something that John Church has done, or will do?

Carl replied: John Church's forecast does account for self-employment and retirees, just as historical figures, which are factored into his model. The purpose of the growth driver survey was to measure and project self-employment and retirement population.

- Should we wait to do a build-out scenario before taking it along with the forecast? What is driving the timeframe?

Charles replied: The challenge is taking the comprehensive plans and trying to factor in the interpretation of allowable range of densities.

- We are trying to take an alternative process for forecasts to the Board. How do we make that recommendation until we've seen the forecasts to determine if they are accurate or if they need to be adjusted?
- Looking at the build-out is a good idea.
- It is going to be hard to get an accurate build-out and it would be useful to compare communities.

Charles commented that John Church has established a new forecast that is more aggressive than the numbers we have in hand. This is not a build-out but a revamping of what has been done and providing additional assumptions. This will be treated as a regional control total for a low-end forecast going into the next plan.

- Are we going back to a regional control total?

Charles replied: Yes, in the sense that this establishes a base for a control total. This provides one view point. Do we give the Board all the options at once and ask them to choose? No, we're saying that all these will be evaluated throughout the plan process.

- We do have an option with the build-out analysis. It is easy to generate a range by looking at potential lows and highs according to the build-out analysis.

Charles stated that at the October meeting, RTAC will be requested to make a recommendation to present John Church's forecast to the Board as one view of the future in preparing for the 2010 plan.

C. Review Findings and Recommendation from U.S. 20/26 Corridor Preservation Study

Don Matson stated that because discussion of this item is not a pressing issue and because of the time constraints of this meeting, this item may be tabled for the next scheduled meeting.

D. Status Report – Transportation Project Coordination Options

Charles Trainor presented documentation of efforts developed over the past month to coordinate local and GARVEE construction projects at the request of the Executive Committee.

E. FY 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Calendar – Information Only

OTHER

Next Meeting: Wednesday, October 24, 2007, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

Dean Gunderson requested setting up a work session for the CIM project adjustment policy. Nichoel Baird Spencer suggested that Charles Trainor create an outline of how he would like to handle the process and thereafter form a sub-committee.

Toni Tisdale commented that Randy Kyrias has left his position at Valley Regional Transit and accepted a position at the Idaho Transportation Department as Public Transportation Administrator.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:24 a.m.

T:\FY07\800 System Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RTAC\Minutes\minutes092607.doc