



Regional Technical Advisory Committee
September 28, 2005
Community Planning Association

*****Minutes*****

ATTENDEES: Kevin Bittner, Valley Regional Transit
 Ryan Culter, Canyon County Development Services
 Karen Gallagher, City of Boise
 Dean Gunderson, Ada County
 Leonard Herr, Department of Environmental Quality
 Kendall Kemmer, Ada County Highway District, (for Don Kostelec,
Chair)
 Gordon Law, City of Caldwell
 Shawn Martin, Ada County Highway District
 Steve Siddoway, City of Meridian (**Interim Chair**)
 Nichoel Baird Spencer, City of Eagle
 Dennis Stegenga, City of Star
 Sue Sullivan, Idaho Transportation Department-District 3
 Toni Tisdale, COMPASS (*Ex-Officio*)

ABSENT: John Anderson, Boise Air Terminal
 Casey Bequeath, Canyon Highway District #4
 Mary Berent, City of Middleton, **Vice Chair**
 Wendel Bigham, Meridian School District Transportation
 Jim Buffington, Nampa Highway District #1
 Paul Raymond, City of Nampa
 Pam Sheldon, Capital City Development Corporation
 Sarah Stobaugh, Boise Independent School District
 (Vacant), City of Garden City
 (Vacant), City of Kuna

OTHERS

ATTENDING: Joshua Johnson, Canyon County Development Services
Patricia Nilsson, COMPASS
Sai Kumar Sarepalli, Holladay Engineering
Charles Trainor, COMPASS
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

CALL TO ORDER

Steve Siddoway called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m.

Introductions were made of all attendees.

Since a quorum was not present, discussion began with Information Item IV-A.

INFORMATION ITEM

Status of FY2006 – 2010 Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP)

Patricia Nilsson stated the COMPASS Board adopted the final project lists for the FY2006-2010 TIP at their September 19, 2005 meeting and COMPASS staff is in the process of preparing the final TIP report. The TIP is now in an Access database and all the project locations have been geo-coded. The next step will be the assembly of a geography that is meaningful for each member agency. Financial descriptions have been received from the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). The final documents for the FY2006-2010 Transportation Improvement Programs will be distributed upon their publication.

With quorum now present, discussion moved to the Action Items.

Toni Tisdale explained that neither the RTAC Chair nor Vice Chair were able to attend today's meeting and Steve Siddoway was asked to preside over the meeting in their absence. The Committee is now being asked for acceptance of this change.

Sue Sullivan moved and Dennis Stegenga seconded to allow Steve Siddoway to serve as interim Chair in Don Kostelec and Mary Berent's absence. There being no further discussion the motion was unanimously approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

**Approve Minutes of July 27, 2005 RTAC Meeting
Approve Minutes of August 24, 2005 RTAC Meeting**

Dean Gunderson moved and Dennis Stegenga seconded to approve the July 27, 2005 and August 24, 2005 minutes as written. There being no further discussion the motion was unanimously approved.

Recommend Staff Review of the Avimor Planned Community Application

Charles Trainor stated that post the original agenda for this meeting an amended agenda was sent out with the attachment of a staff review of the Avimor Planned Community. It is a COMPASS policy that reviews of planned communities be prepared by staff and then reviewed and endorsed, or not endorsed, by the Regional Technical Advisory Committee. Committee

comments are sought on the review that was conducted by Charles and as to whether there is merit to recommend action for Board approval at the October 17 meeting.

It is Charles Trainor's recommendation to RTAC to recommend to the COMPASS Board that Ada County consider amending its ordinance to require that planned communities be subject to a comprehensive plan amendment. RTAC's recommendation would be included in the cover letter to Carla Olson at Ada County Development Services.

After discussion, Karen Gallagher suggested adding a sentence to the letter stating that even though the planned communities are within what the TAZ is predicting, it is being met 15 years ahead. A clear timeframe needs to be stated.

Charles Trainor suggested the additional language be included on page 3 under the Conclusions' paragraph.

Dean Gunderson concurred with Charles to include an additional sentence after the first paragraph under Conclusions which would read: "Assuming the Avimor proposal draws from the same market as does North Eagle and the Dry Creek area, this is probably correct, *yet this does present an acceleration of the projected growth within this TAZ 228.*"

Also, the first sentence of the fourth paragraph should be amended to read: "Given the potential impacts of *potential future development throughout Ada County*, members...." This correctly reflects the Committee's concern about development that would occur not only along the Highway 55 corridor but also in other areas that could represent planned communities.

Charles Trainor stated the amendments as stated are acceptable.

Dean Gunderson moved and Dennis Stegenga seconded to approve the staff analysis as modified.

Discussion:

Karen Gallagher asked if the modification included the acceleration of the need for improvements on Highway 55. Dean Gunderson replied that it did.

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

Charles Trainor stated, given that RTAC is not recommending that the plan needs to be changed because it is moot; does the Committee believe that this item has merit in going before the COMPASS Board at its October 17 meeting?

Dean Gunderson replied that per the adopted Board policy, this item is required to go before the Board even if the recommendation represents a moot issue.

Charles Trainor commented that the COMPASS Executive Committee is meeting at 1:30 p.m. today and this proposal would be made as an amendment to the agenda.

Dean Gunderson moved and Karen Gallagher seconded to stay compliant with COMPASS Board policy. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Draft Transportation Networks under Communities in Motion

Charles Trainor stated the memorandum included in the meeting packet was basically the same memorandum given to the COMPASS Board with the exception of a couple of supplemental pieces. Costing for the Trend roadway network was received which came in at \$3.25 million. The base transit system, which is basically what we have today, would be \$366 million over the 25-year period, coming to a total for the Trend optimal transportation system of \$3.6 billion. The Community Choices major roadway investments come to \$2.5 billion but the transit system escalates to approximately \$1.8 billion, leaving a total of approximately \$4.3 billion to fund the transportation system under Community Choices. This information will be discussed at the October 5 and 6 Open Houses.

After further discussion, Dean Gunderson thanked staff for their additional effort that was required to work through these gross numbers and reduce them down to what may be the individual costs per households since the \$1.8 billion is outside one's imagination and ability to understand.

Sue Sullivan referred to the map which still shows the interchange to Franklin Road. The structure at that interchange will be very complex. It is hard to show what will happen. Charles Trainor suggested showing it as a configure "8." Sue suggested inserting a green line that shows the connection.

Regarding the roads under ITD's jurisdiction, Sue had hoped to reflect to the public that access management is intended to move forward on all the routes because of their volume. When looking at the map there are four to five lanes on Chinden which could lead someone to think that there will be a continuous turn lane.

Toni Tisdale replied that a note will be added stating that all roadways that have 25,000 or more vehicles per day are subject to access management. Patricia Nilsson stated if it is organized at a corridor level it would be a much more pronounced statement for each of the corridors.

Sue Sullivan commented that as we move forward there will be a need to expand the discussion that we have several roads, whether built or not, that have opportunity for about 15 miles of connectivity. We need to address the issue of how these roads are going to be treated. This leads to the idea of corridor preservation such as Purple Sage to Beacon Light. This is a long corridor that needs attention as a longer than 20-year range.

Another issue is that future freeways are not shown because with Community Choices they are not yet needed. It is important that discussions begin for recognition of what will come in the next 20 years and beyond.

Charles Trainor suggested that rather than showing future freeways on a map, address them in a policy. If we do that, it is a study that needs to proceed immediately, not just shown as a line on the map that is going to do something. This would be a mega-million dollar study that would happen within the next five years to actually identify and preserve a corridor. Sue Sullivan stated in relation to that, perhaps a discussion in the document could address the tools that are needed to do the preservation; do we have enough tools and do we need to talk to the legislature about additional tools.

Dean Gunderson stated that the TAZ data is very important. There is a concern that existing development is graphically shown in gray. It is in fact, a broad mix of land uses which could have a substantive impact on the type of new development that would occur next to it. It would be a good idea to add a footnote stating that access management would occur but it should be expanded to explain the meaning of access management.

Steve Siddoway commented that regarding the north Meridian area roads for Community Choices, he has a meeting with Ada County Development Services to talk about the north Meridian area traffic study that was just done.

Charles Trainor emphasized that the philosophy going into this plan was to focus on arterials and higher and public transportation issues and alternatives. We would not be developing collector recommendations.

Review Amendments to RTAC Bylaws

Toni Tisdale stated this is an information item that will be brought back to RTAC at its next scheduled meeting for approval and recommendation to the COMPASS Board. The suggested red-lined changes to the Bylaws address the issue of adding a voting member from the Public Participation Committee (PPC), which was a COMPASS Board directive to obtain more citizen involvement throughout the agency. All technical committees within COMPASS will have a citizen representative. The appointed citizen will be a voting member of RTAC.

Discussion about Legislative Issues

Toni Tisdale stated the state legislature will start meeting again in January, as well as Congress at the national level. Last year COMPASS staff started preparing “white papers” on specific issues. This is a plea to the Committee to start looking at the issues that may come up and forwarding them to COMPASS staff. If the Committee knows of upcoming legislative issues which would affect transportation in particular, forward them to Toni Tisdale and they will be added to future agendas for discussion.

Discussion about Set-Aside Funds

Toni Tisdale stated that Scott Polikov, a planner and attorney from Austin, Texas, spoke at a public function, as well as the COMPASS Board’s September 19, 2005 meeting to share his experiences as a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) Board member for the Austin, Texas region. Scott spoke about setting aside 10 to 25% of available funds through the TIP process which would be applied to the project that best incorporates the mix of land use and transportation.

Patricia Nilsson commented that other MPOs have much larger allocations and the percentage of funds is more meaningful in terms of the number of projects. There may be some value in looking at this process for our region. This is in the context of the prioritization process that will be developed for *Communities in Motion* and will provide special funding to try and accomplish a strategic initiative. A smaller example would be ACHD’s neighborhood enhancement. In the context of *Communities in Motion*, it may involve a particular corridor that goes through several jurisdictions. This is a way to take something off the top to accomplish something bigger.

Steve Siddoway commented that we need some level of assurance that the projects that are in the TIP and the STIP are in there because they are deemed to be very important projects. We want to make sure we are not funding less important projects just for the sake of having a program. We need to make sure that the highly important projects are the ones getting funded. This is an issue that will be discussed more in the future.

Discussion of Right-of-Way Preservation

Sue Sullivan stated there are multi-millions of dollars of right-of-way (ROW) that we are going to need to buy for all the improvements in the Valley. Do we have the tools to get out in front of it to preserve it, do we have enough money to buy it and, if we do not have either of those, do we have the fortitude to plow ahead? ITD is seeking input from RTAC on how to preserve the ROW, what can we do within the limits of the law and, what recommendations could be moved forward to the legislature. Until this is seen as a crisis, not much will be done.

Patricia Nilsson commented that she will recommend to Matt Stoll that a working committee be formed to look at the land use controls available and even come up with an ordinance. We would need respective attorneys to oversee this effort as well. We do not have to wait to proceed. There are land use tools used for preservation of public land in terms of the dedication of a ROW. If RTAC approves then this process can move forward.

After further discussion, **Dean Gunderson moved and Sue Sullivan seconded to recommend the formation of a committee to look at the land use controls available and address the kind of changes that have to happen. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.**

Discussion on Transportation Studies Coordination Project

Toni Tisdale stated that many changes were received from Sue Sullivan with regard to ITD projects. There is a "Studies" link on the COMPASS website that lists all the regional studies throughout the region. If there are other changes, please let Toni know as soon as possible and they will be uploaded to the website.

NEXT MEETING:

The next RTAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 26, 2005, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

T:\FY06\800 Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RTAC\Minutes\minutes092805.doc