



**TREASURE VALLEY HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STUDY
DOWNTOWN POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

3:30 P.M.

Monday, May 12, 2008

**LOCATION: Capital City Development Corporation, Conference Room
805 W. Idaho, Boise, Idaho**

****AGENDA****

Item	Speaker	Action Needed	Time/ Documentation
1. Review Minutes – DPAC Meeting Minutes from 04/14/08 are attached <i>Pages 2-4</i>	Dale Higer	Approval	5 Minutes Information Attached
2. Recommend a Preferred Candidate Site <i>A preferred candidate site will be sent to FTA by July 15, 2008. Pages 5-7</i>	Bob Post	Approval	30 Minutes Information Attached
3. NEPA Documentation <i>The NEPA documentation will accompany the preferred site. The attachment provides the schedule for completion. Page 8</i>	Bob Post	Review	10 Minutes Information Attached
4. Review Of Downtown Circulator Initial Segment Alternatives <i>A workshop on April 21 generated the core alignment and options. Pages 9-13</i>	Bob Post	Review	15 Minutes Information Attached
5. Review May 22, 2008 Public Meeting <i>A public meeting to present the recommended site and status of options has been scheduled.</i>	Rosemary Curtin	Review	10 Minutes
6. Agency Letters of Support <i>Letters of support for the preferred site are sought from key agencies. Page 14</i>	Charles Trainor	Review	10 Minutes Information Attached
7. Schedule and Next Steps <i>A revised schedule is attached. Pages 15-17</i>	All	Review	5 Minutes Information Attached



**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study
Downtown Policy Advisory Committee
April 14, 2008 Meeting Minutes
Capital City Development Corporation Conference Room
Boise, Idaho**

- Attendees:** A.J. Balukoff, Community Planning Association Representative
Ed Dahlberg, Boise Metro Chamber of Commerce Representative
David Eberle, Councilman, City of Boise
Dale Higer, Private Sector Representative – At Large
Cheryl Larabee, Capital City Corporation Board of Directors
Monte McClure, Idaho Transportation Board
Jim Tomlinson, Downtown Boise Association Representative
Paul Woods, Commissioner, Ada County
- Members Absent:** Rebecca Arnold, Commissioner, Ada County Highway District
Rob Hopper, Councilman, City of Caldwell, Valley Regional Transit Representative
- Others:** Nancy Brecks, Community Planning Association
Donn Carnahan, Keller Associates
Jon Cecil, Capital City Development Corporation
Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
Bryant Forrester, Urban Concepts
Miguel Gaddi, HDR
Phil Kushlan, Capital City Development Corporation
Kathleen Lacey, City of Boise
Katey Levihn, Keller Associates
Mark McLaren, HDR
Kate Nice, RBCI
Bob Post, URS Corporation
Charles Trainor, Community Planning Association

Call to Order

Chair Higer called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Due to lack of quorum, Chair Higer asked for any objection to moving to discussion Item II. Hearing none, Chair Higer so ordered.

1. Update on Property Owner Discussion

Phil Kushlan provided an update on the status of current Candidate Sites. He stated the property owners of Site B have indicated they are not ready to participate at this time. The property owners of Site C have stated they are no longer interested and have taken the site off the table. The property owners of Site A are still interested, and Site H, a half block located between Idaho and Bannock Streets on the east side of 11th Street, has been added to the list.

(Quorum reached at 3:37 p.m.)

2. Review Minutes

David Eberle moved and Cheryl Larabee seconded approval of the March 17, 2008 meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Review of Additional Candidate Sites

Bob Post reviewed Candidate Site H. It is smaller than other sites, which introduces constraints in accommodating all the functions and will require use of 11th Street frontage in order to accommodate the desired number of bus bays. There is also a drive-thru facility for the bank that will need to be incorporated into the design. The site will interface well with existing and planned bus routes as well as the planned downtown circulator. The site is consistent with the project Purpose and Needs statements and other criteria utilized to identify the list of candidate sites previously evaluated as potential downtown multimodal center sites and within the preferred area identified in the *Downtown Boise Mobility Study*.

4. Update Site Evaluation Matrix and Rank Order

Mark McLaren reviewed the ranking of Candidate Site H. He stated, based on the evaluation matrix, Site H ranked high in the opportunity it provides.

A.J. Balukoff noted all the criteria has been ranked exactly the same, and questioned if some of the elements should be assigned different weights based on the importance of the factors.

After discussion, **Ed Dahlberg moved and A.J. Balukoff seconded to direct the consultants to prepare weighted rankings of Sites A and H. Motion passed with Jim Tomlinson and Monte McClure abstaining.**

5. Report on Adjacent Businesses and Public Meeting

Kate Nice, RBCI, presented a draft summary of the April 1, 2008, Adjacent Business and Property Owner meeting. She stated 40 people attended.

The Committee requested that staff respond to questions from the public by email or mail.

6. NEPA Strategy & Schedule

Bob Post reviewed the NEPA strategy and schedule. He stated the project type is eligible to qualify for a Categorical Exclusion to comply with NEPA requirements, which involves less time and resources to complete than either an Environmental Assessment or a full Environmental Impact Statement. Based on an initial review and discussions with FTA it is unlikely that a full Environmental Impact Statement will be required for this project, regardless of the site selected. The goal is to have DPAC select a site at the May 2008 meeting to be submitted to FTA by July 15, 2008.

7. Agency Review

Charles Trainor stated the final decision of site selection could be made by the Valley Regional Transit Management Committee at a June 2008 meeting. Concurrence with the recommended site by Boise City (land use), Capital City Development Corporation (development and design), Downtown Boise Association (business), Ada County Highway District (roadways), and COMPASS (metropolitan planning organization) will be requested. Since the COMPASS Board will not be meeting in May 2008, staff will present the proposed sites to the Board at the April 21, 2008, meeting.

8. Next Steps/Next Meeting

The next DPAC meeting is scheduled for May 12, 2008, at CCDC from 3:30-5:30.

Agenda Items:

- 1. Review Weighted Ranking of Candidate Sites A and H**
- 2. Selection of Candidate Site**
- 3. Discuss Circulator Financing/Feasibility**

Adjournment:

Monte McClure moved and A.J. Balukoff seconded adjournment at 5:00 p.m.

MAY 5, 2008

Topic: Recommend a Preferred Candidate Site

Summary:

COMPASS, in cooperation with Valley Regional Transit, is conducting a study to identify a site for the development of a multi-modal transit center in downtown Boise. This project, and area considered for potential sites were previously identified as a part of the Downtown Boise Mobility Study (DBMS).

The project team is presenting a ranking of two potential sites based on a refined technical evaluation in response to the DPAC meeting of April 14, 2008. Also presented is a recommendation on the preferred site to be advanced to the Federal Transit Administration for the required NEPA clearance.

Staff Recommendation/Request:

Staff requests concurrence of the technical ranking undertaken for two candidate sites and a recommendation that the Multimodal Site H be advanced as the preferred site.

Implication (policy and/or financial):

Priority ranking and selection of a preferred site is necessary to advance the project in the NEPA process as prescribed by the Federal Transit Administration for federal funding eligibility.

Highlights:

Based on the previous evaluation of five potential sites for the proposed Boise Multi-Modal Transit Center (MMTC), two sites were shortlisted for further evaluation. This evaluation included the weighted evaluation of several of the key criterion, as well as additional site reconnaissance to clearly understand site constraints.

For the two sites, the evaluation matrix was updated to provide weighted measure of thee critical criterion under consideration. These included:

Location relative to identified siting area in the DBMS;

Ability to accommodate the essential functions; and

Structures, Displacements.

The results of the evaluation are summarized in the matrix attached as Exhibit A. Based on the evaluation presented in the matrix, the sites are fairly similar, but are ranked in priority (highest to lowest) order as summarized below:

Site H

Site H has the advantage of location with respect to the downtown core and employment, connects best to the existing bus network and the circulator alignments, is adjacent to more eminent and concrete development sites and would appear to be best positions regarding parking options to serve any on-site development. The disadvantages include the site size and the necessity to accommodate banking functions

that would be displaced at the corner of Bannock and 11th Street.

Site A

Site A has the advantages of the site size, the flexibility represented by the Grove Street right-of-way, proximity to the proposed Convention Center its role in how the Grove Street corridor could become a positive addition to the downtown. The key disadvantages are its proximity to the downtown core, business displacement, and less than obvious solutions to the provision of parking to serve the proposed on-site mixed use development.





With the concurrence of the technical ranking of these sites and recommendation of Site H as the preferred site, the staffs of COMPASS, VRT and the consulting team will continue to advance work on Site H in preparation and support of submitting the required NEPA documentation to FTA. The identification of Site H as the preferred site for the Downtown Boise Multimodal Center does not dismiss further consideration of Site A if events result in Site H being able to be advanced as the selected site.

More Information / Attachments:

Contact Bob Post, URS Project Manager at 503 948-7230 or Miguel Gaddi, HDR at 208 387-7000

Attached is an evaluation matrix of the two remaining candidate sites.

T:\FY08\600 Projects\631 TVHCTS\Meetings\DTAC\Agendas-Packets\5-12-08\May 12 MMC Site Recommendation DPAC memo.doc

CANDIDATE SITES ANALYSIS MATRIX				
	CANDIDATE SITE			
	A		H	
Transportation				
Pedestrian access to downtown core (8th and Main St.)	0.36 mile	○	0.25 mile	●
Access to employment	Low	○	High	●
Fixed route bus access (schedule impacts)	Low	○	Medium	⊙
Ease of circulator access	Medium	⊙	High	●
Ease of priority corridor access	Medium	⊙	Low	○
Site ingress and egress - Access from and to adjacent roadways		⊙		○
Traffic impacts	Higher impact	○	Moderate impact	⊙
Site Localization, Size and Configuration				
Location relative to identified siting area in DBMS*	Adjacent	⊙	Within	●
Site size	78,000 sqf.	●	38,700 sqf.	○
Block face utilization potential	Medium	⊙	Low	○
Ability to accommodate essential functions	High	●	Medium	⊙
Land Use & Development				
Allowable use under current zoning	Yes	●	Yes	●
Compatibility with adjacent uses	High	●	Medium	⊙
Proximity to existing publicly controlled off street parking	Medium	⊙	Medium	⊙
Environmental				
Structures / Displacements	2 Structures / 1 Business / Parking	○	Drive through / Parking	⊙
Utility impacts	2 light poles/3 phase overhead - No main water lines on site	⊙	2 Pad mounts, underground 3 phase powerline, small power vault	⊙
Feasibility of Geothermal Power	Medium	⊙	High	●
Adjacent sensitive development	Medium (SF unit)	⊙	Medium (Bank)	⊙
Potential hazmat issues	Potential Petroleum & Hazmat	⊙	Potential Petroleum & Hazmat	⊙
Financial				
Property owners interest in P3	Yes	●	Yes	●
Land value (estimated market value at \$36 per sqf.)**	\$2,800,000	⊙	\$1,400,000	●
Implementation & Schedule				
Ease of acquisition	Medium	⊙	Medium	⊙
Public Support				
Support based on Open House #1 comments	Low	○	Medium***	⊙
SCORE		48		58
 The variable scores the same for both side. Value is cancelled - not accounted				Value Scale
 The variable score is doubled				● 5
				⊙ 3
				○ 1
*Downtown Boise Mobility Study				
**Land area calculation inclusive of public ROW (Site A: Alley ROW, Site C2: Grove St ROW)				
***Site H was not under consideration at the time of the open house. The assigned value is based on comments received on attributes of other sites that are applicable to site H				

May 12, 2008

Topic: Update; Multimodal Center NEPA Documentation

Summary:

The preparation of the federally required NEPA documents for the Multimodal Sites A and H are currently underway. For each site a Documented Categorical Exclusion (DCE) document is being prepared in accordance with the directives provided by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The FTA will be the federal agency which must approve and sign off on the NEPA document. A detailed schedule for preparation and submittal of the DCE has been prepared and to date all activities are on schedule.

Staff Recommendation / Request:

This is an update on the activity to date, no action by DTAC or DPAC is requested.

Implication (policy and/or financial):

The FTA requires that a project such as the Downtown Boise Multimodal Center have prepared and received approval of an appropriate level of NEPA documentation prior to initiation of acquisition of properties required to implement the project.

Highlights:

<u>DCE Component</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Status</u>
Area of Potential Effect (APE) Submittal to FTA & SHPO	4-18-08	completed
Project Definition - must include a general description of any planned joint development (public-private).	4-25-08	completed
Draft DCE Document -	5-20-08	on schedule
Submit draft DCE to FTA for initial review	5-26-08	
Receipt of FTA comments	6-23-08	
Submit revised/final DCE document to FTA	7-10-08	
FTA sign-off on the DCE document	7-25-08	

More Information / Attachments:

Attachments - None

Contact Bob Post, URS Project Manager at 503 948-7230.

May 12, 2008

Topic: Review Of Downtown Circulator Initial Segment Alternatives

Summary:

At the February 11, meeting of the DPAC, a modified Alignment Alternative C was adopted as the preferred Downtown Boise Circulator System Plan. In adopting the modified Alternative C plan, it was noted by both the DTAC and DPAC that each of the system alternatives reviewed contained a strong east-west alignment component serving a large number of both existing and planned destinations. An east-west alignment was regarded as being a strong candidate for an initial segment alignment. At the March 7, DTAC and March 17, DPAC meetings four candidate initial segment alignment alternatives were presented and commented on in terms of how well each served various downtown destinations. The alignments focused on providing connections to the then identified multimodal candidate sites A, B, C and C2. On April 21, a workshop was conducted to undertake a more detailed review of potential initial segment alignments and to focus the review more specifically on serving the then two remaining multimodal candidate Sites A and H (a new site not identified at the time of the March review of potential circulator alignments). Staff representatives from VRT, COMPASS, City of Boise, CCDC, ITD and ACHD participated in the workshop that resulted in the identification of alignment options that would serve a combination of existing and planned development and the two remaining candidate multimodal sites. Exhibit A illustrates the circulator alignments identified at the circulator workshop. Subsequent to the workshop the consultant team developed four representative alignment alternatives that incorporate various combinations of the alignments identified at the workshop. The four alignment options are attached as Exhibits B, C, D and E.

Recommendation/Request:

New circulator systems in urban environments, particularly those utilizing streetcar technologies, have focused on minimum length and least cost initial segments that accomplish the following objectives:

- Connection of a number of higher priority downtown destinations
- Support planned development opportunities
- Exhibit a high probability of success from a ridership perspective
- Have the ability to be expanded into the planned full system
- Have access to an operations and maintenance facility

In addition, for Boise the circulator must provide access to the recommended preferred multimodal center Site H.

The alignment options titled *Main, Idaho Couplet* (Exhibit B) and *Main, Idaho/Idaho, Bannock Couplet* (Exhibit C) best meet the above stated objectives and are recommended to be advanced to the next level of assessment.

Implication (policy and/or financial):

The alternative alignments each raise policy questions regarding tradeoffs between serving existing development that represents short-term ridership potential versus the use of the circulator investment as a catalyst for planned and desired new development. The recommended alignments provide a balance between these important considerations. The two recommended alignment options do not reach all the desired locations and therefore represent a compromise between the cost of an initial investment and the locations to be served.

Highlights:

The purpose of the April 21, 2008 workshop was to identify candidate initial segments to be carried forward for additional review and assessment. Workshop participants confirmed previously stated preferences that the initial segment should be comprised of an east-west component through the downtown core. The participants reviewed a wide range of alignment options and concluded that between 3rd and 10th Streets the use of a Main and Idaho Street couplet was the preferred alignment due to the following advantages:

- The alignment is more conducive to both auto and transit traffic than other available options such as Bannock Street.
- Greater pedestrian safety due to the one-way traffic pattern.
- Better proximity to existing public parking.
- Provides a more central alignment location within the downtown
- Transit trip attractors are fairly evenly distributed to both the north and south of the Main and Idaho couplet.
- Ability to make use of a portion of the previous transit improvements on Main and Idaho Streets.

The workshop participants reviewed a number of alignment and terminal points at both the east and west ends of the downtown. Considerable attention was given to balancing the length (cost) against the desire to provide service to both existing and planned development. Exhibit A illustrates the various alignment options explored at the workshop. Also identified at the workshop were potential Operations and Maintenance facility sites that would be required if a streetcar alternative were implemented. The importance of ensuring that initial segment alignment alternatives can be extended in the future to such destinations as the 30th Street to the west and BSU was also an important point of discussion.

Based on the workshop results, the consultant team was charged with the development of a short list of representative alignment alternatives incorporating as many of the alignment options as practical from the workshop results. Four alignments were identified:

Main, Idaho Couplet (Exhibit B)

The shortest of the alternatives at 1.15 miles (2.3 track miles) offers the advantages of simplicity, easy pedestrian access to a large number of the major downtown destinations and public parking garages, and can be easily extended to future destinations. Disadvantages include less direct access to emerging

development on Bannock Street between 10th and 13th and the east-bound leg of the alignment does not directly serve the Multimodal Center Site H.

Main, Idaho / Idaho, Bannock Couplet (Exhibit C)

Also a relatively short initial segment of 1.2 miles (2.4 track miles) that also would be an easily communicated alignment with good pedestrian access to a large number of major downtown destinations and public parking garages. This alignment provides better access to the pending Bannock Street development and provides direct access in both the east and west bound directions to the Multimodal Center Site H. Disadvantages include the mixed traffic operation on the single east-bound lane of Bannock Street that also includes a designated bicycle lane and a more difficult transition to the Main/Fairview Couplet to extend the alignment to the west.

Main, Idaho Couplet with 13th Street Extension to River Street (Exhibit D)

This longer alignment, 1.45 miles (2.9 track miles) serves most of the major downtown destinations as the above two alignments while also directly serving a portion of the Linen District, the proposed Convention Center site, and the multi-family housing development occurring south of Myrtle along 13th Street. Disadvantages of the alignment include the less direct service to the Bannock Street development; the east-bound leg of the alignment does not directly serve the Multimodal Center Site H, and the greater cost due to the added length.

Main, Idaho Couplet with A Broadway Avenue Extension (Exhibit E)

The longest of the four alignments, 1.55 miles (3.1 track miles) serves the major downtown destinations and public parking with an easily understood alignment while adding more direct service to the Broadway Avenue corridor and to the Courthouse area, and the proposed mixed use and office complexes in the vicinity of Broadway and Front. Disadvantages of the alignment include the less direct service to the Bannock Street development, less direct service to the Site H, the traffic complication of navigating the section of Broadway between Warm Springs Avenue and Front Street, and the greater cost due to the added length.

Next Steps:


The selected initial segment alignments will be laid out in a conceptual-level design that will identify locations within the right-of-way, identify any significant utility, access or traffic impacts that may suggest modifying an alignment or the location in the street right of way. Also identified will be stop locations, interface with the selected multimodal center site and layout and confirmation of the ability of candidate operations and maintenance sites to accommodate the anticipated fleet size. The ability of each alignment to accommodate future extensions will also be evaluated. A detailed operations plan will be developed including confirmation of the required fleet size. Based on the above work items both an operations and capital cost estimate will be developed.

More Information / Attachments:


Attachments - 2

Contact Bob Post, URS Project Manager at 503 948-7230.

Boise Circulator Potential Route Concepts from Workshop



Boise Circulator: Main, Idaho Couplet



Estimated Vehicle Requirements and Annual Operating Costs

	Total Track Miles	Cycle Time with Layover	Num. of Vehicles Required	Annual Operating Cost
10 min Headway	2.3	17	2	\$ 885,000
15 min Headway	2.3	17	2	\$ 885,000

Assumptions:

1. Operating cost is \$101 per hour (A 40% increase over the existing bus operating cost).
2. Cycle times include 20% layover.
3. Operating speed (10 mph) includes platform dwell time. Actual travel speeds between stops are higher
4. Service Spans: 15 hours weekday, 12 hours Saturdays. No service on Sundays
5. 251 Weekdays and 52 Saturdays. No service on Sundays
6. Vehicle requirements do not include spares

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study**Downtown Boise Multimodal Center**

May 12, 2008

Topic: Agency Letters of Support**Summary:**

In early June the VRT Management Committee will be asked to approve a preferred site for the downtown Boise Multimodal Center (MMC). The preferred site, along with the environmental documentation, will be submitted to the Federal Transit Administration in July 2008. The process and calendar is based on qualifying the MMC site as a “documented categorical exclusion” or DCE. A DCE is the simplest, quickest environmental process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Of the various sites considered, only two are now left as viable candidates. Moving quickly to select the best of the two and then, following FTA approval, to negotiate an agreement on the site is imperative. Full support from local agencies will abet Valley Regional Transit’s action in June.

Staff Recommendation / Request:

Staff requests letters of support from the following agencies based on their oversight of or involvement in key areas:

City of Boise – Land Use

Ada County Highway District – Local Roadways

Idaho Transportation District – State Roadways/Public Transportation

Capital City Development Corporation – Redevelopment

COMPASS – Regional Planning

Downtown Boise Association – Business Community in Downtown0

Implication (policy and/or financial):

Letters of support would support the case for a DCE by demonstrating that there is full agreement with the recommendation.

Highlights:

None.

More Information / Attachments:

Attachments - None

Contact Charles Trainor, at 855-2558 ext. 232 or ctrainor@compassidaho.org.

T:\FY08\600 Projects\631 TVHCTS\Meetings\DTAC\Agendas-Packets\5-12-08\May12 support letters memo.doc

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study
Meeting Schedule, Agenda & Action Items**

Item 7

Date	Committee	Agenda Items	Action Items
May 5, 2008	DPAC Mailout DTAC Mailout		
May 5, 2008	VRT Management Committee		
May 12, 2008 8:30 – 10:30 a.m. 10:30 – 11:30 a.m.	DTAC Exec. Workgroup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend Preferred Site (MMC) • Initial Segment Alignment Review (DBC) • NEPA Document Update (MMC) • Open House 2 Update (MMC/DBC) 	Adopt Site Recommendation (MMC)
May 12, 2008 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.	DPAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend Preferred Site (MMC) • Initial Segment Alignment Review (DBC) • NEPA Document Update (MMC) • Open House 2 Update (MMC/DBC) 	Adopt Site Recommendation (MMC)
May 22, 2008	Open House #2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Meeting on Two Remaining Sites 	
May 21, 2008	VRT Board Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Site Recommendation (MMC) • NEPA Document Update (MMC) 	Authorize VRT Management Committee to ratify MMC site
June 2, 2008	DPAC Mailout DTAC Mailout		
June 2, 2008	VRT Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Site Recommendation (MMC) 	Adopt Site Recommendation

MMC – Downtown Boise Multimodal Center DBC – Downtown Boise Circulator PC – Priority Corridor

May 6, 2008

Q:\VRT Committees\D-PAC Downtown Policy Advisory Group\2008 D-PAC Meetings\D-PAC 05-12-08\Item 7-Meeting Schedule.doc

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study
Meeting Schedule, Agenda & Action Items**

Date	Committee	Agenda Items	Action Items
	Committee		(MMC)
June 9, 2008 8:30 – 10:30 a.m. 10:30 – 11:30 a.m.	DTAC Exec. Workgroup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Site Concept Design (MMC) • Initial Segment Alignment Recommendation (DBC) • NEPA Documentation Update (MMC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt Initial Segment Alignment (DBC)
June 9, 2008 3:30 – 5:30 p.m.	DPAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Site Concept Design (MMC) • Initial Segment Alignment Recommendation (DBC) • NEPA Documentation Update (MMC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt Initial Segment Alignment (DBC)
July 10, 2008	Submit MMC Site and NEPA Documentation to FTA		
July 16, 2008	VRT Board Meeting		
August 4, 2008	VRT Management Committee		
September 8, 2008	VRT Management Committee		
September 17, 2008	VRT Board Meeting		
October 6, 2008	VRT Management Committee		
November 3, 2008	VRT Management		

MMC – Downtown Boise Multimodal Center DBC – Downtown Boise Circulator PC – Priority Corridor

May 6, 2008

Q:\VRT Committees\D-PAC Downtown Policy Advisory Group\2008 D-PAC Meetings\D-PAC 05-12-08\Item 7-Meeting Schedule.doc

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study
Meeting Schedule, Agenda & Action Items**

Date	Committee	Agenda Items	Action Items
	Committee		
November 19, 2008	VRT Board Meeting		
December 1, 2008	VRT Management Committee		

MMC – Downtown Boise Multimodal Center DBC – Downtown Boise Circulator PC – Priority Corridor

May 6, 2008

Q:\VRT Committees\D-PAC Downtown Policy Advisory Group\2008 D-PAC Meetings\D-PAC 05-12-08\Item 7-Meeting Schedule.doc