



Consortium Committee Meeting

Thursday, September 10, 2009, 1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.

*COMPASS, Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho*

DRAFT AGENDA

- I. Consent Agenda**
 - a. Approval of the June 11, 2009 Meeting Notes (page 2) **

- II. Action Items**
 - a. Direction on Maintaining BGG Non-Profit Status*

- III. Information/Discussion Items**
 - a. Review Progress of Work Groups*
 - *Status Report Monitoring/Public Outreach Education – Deanna Smith (page 10) **
 - *Area of Impact – Anna Canning*
 - *Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Accounting – Sally Goodell (page 11) **

 - b. Review Comprehensive Plan Buildout Analysis – Charles Trainor (page 12) **

- IV. Other Items**

- V. Adjournment**

* Attachments

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Consortium\agenda091009.doc



Consortium Committee Meeting
Thursday, June 11, 2009, 1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.
COMPASS, Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho

MINUTES

I. Consent Agenda

Approval of the March 12, 2009 Meeting Notes

David Zarembo requested a correction to his comments in the first paragraph on page 4, from "...when full buildout is..." to "...what full buildout of the Valley is..."

Nate Mitchell moved and Phil Bandy seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

II. Information/Discussion Items

a. Review Progress of Work Groups:

Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Accounting

Sally Goodell recapped the Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Accounting Work Group assigned tasks and schedule. The first task is to quantify the existing comprehensive plans to establish a baseline against which we measure changes in comprehensive plans and the impact to the transportation system. COMPASS staff has been working with cities' staff in this effort and has found it to be more challenging than anticipated. The conclusion is that the process needs to be broken into two tracks.

The method for quantifying population for the long range transportation plan can be a generalized approach, but when building a baseline that will ultimately be used for quasi-judicial decisions, i.e., adequate public facilities, the question revolves around how much refinement is enough. What levels of accuracy and consistency of data are needed?

COMPASS has developed a first cut of what buildout looks like. The work group members agreed that we need to look at documenting and fine tuning the methodology that was used and adjust the actual population numbers before going forward into the next steps.

Following the proposed schedule, COMPASS will continue working towards the update of *Communities in Motion*. At the same time, COMPASS and the City of Boise will document assumptions and the methods used in Boise's comp plan. This will then be compared to what the other cities have done. This exercise is expected to be finished in early fall 2009 if not sooner. A buildout model run will then be done and the results will be analyzed.

Concurrent with that process, COMPASS will run the model to see what the travel demand looks like. The conversation will then begin about what the policy implications are associated with those results.

ACHD will also be working on the countywide intersection model, which should be completed by the first of August 2009. This will be a key piece in evaluating level of service. ACHD will continue discussions about what traffic impact studies analysis means, and what the process is between COMPASS, ACHD, Cities, ITD, and the County when a comp plan change is proposed.

Elaine Clegg said a comparative analysis needs to be done showing what buildout shows versus what was hoped to be gained with the Community Choices scenario in *Communities in Motion*. Sally stated that can be addressed in the methodology and will help facilitate the discussion around what is wanted.

Matt Stoll noted that discussion will take place at the June 2009 COMPASS Board meeting regarding the Performance Monitoring Report and how *Communities in Motion* is being implemented, i.e., who has adopted it and who hasn't. Staff will discuss what we want to use for the update, Community Choices or Trend for the growth scenario. The financial constraints over the next 25 years will also be reviewed, which will require pulling corridors out of the plan, i.e. key corridors like State Highway 44 and U.S. 20/26.

Elaine said that speaks to how to address travel demand if we can't do it with road expansion.

Matt said the analysis on buildout will help with that. The travel demand model can show what congestion will be if cities grow as they aspire to. Both counties will be looked at as part of *Communities in Motion*. The challenge is not whether a city has adopted the Community Choices scenario, but whether they are following their comp plans and zoning, and considering if there is an adequate transportation system when they are approving development.

Dave Zaremba added that today the Meridian comp plan doesn't reflect everything that is going to happen, and he assumes that is true for the other jurisdictions as well. Idaho Power estimates that the Valley will have 2.5 million people. If after COMPASS adds all of the comp plans together and it doesn't come up with 2.5 million people, then there needs to be a discussion about where all of the rest of the people are going to be.

Charles Trainor replied that COMPASS staff and local staff took the comp plans and came up with a buildout of 3.1 million people, which was a scary number. The process looked at land uses, with reasonable densities that go along with those land uses for each community, using GIS to layer them on top of the things that we know about like flood plains, flood ways, steep slopes, ag land, wildlife habitat, etc., to try and decide what is really going to happen. Charles noted that our numbers were within 5% of Boise City's own estimates. We are calling it a preservation scenario not an investment scenario, because it may not be for 50 years, but at some point we may need it. Cities need to understand what their comp plans mean and if they can live with the assumptions.

Elaine stated we need to understand the assumptions made in that model first before knowing with any certainty whether or not it is adequate.

Sally replied a lot was put together in the first pass. Now we need to carefully look at it and at staff's recommendations on how to fine tune it for the next steps.

Phil Bandy stated this effort will provide value by setting a base line. When we see how the comp plans are going to play out, there will be a lot of people in the Valley who will say that is not the objective we wanted to achieve. The concern is, as Matt said, that we are going to have to look at our choices in the future on projects and roadways. The City of Eagle is trying to increase density in the downtown core and along the corridors to encourage potential future transit options. Dave Jones has stated that the City of Eagle's plans for Hwy 44 are diametrically opposed to what ITD has planned for that roadway.

Matt noted he would disagree that VRT's effort on State Street is different than what is being done for the corridor study, or that they are mutually exclusive, or that they are not compatible. *Communities in Motion* shows that Hwy 44 would carry some sort of public transportation system on it. It is a key mobility corridor for the Valley.

The biggest challenge is that we don't have the money to build the projects we wanted and we are going into a maintenance mode on both the local and state system. So we are not going to be able to expand the system as robustly as we thought we could outside of any stimulus funding and with GARVEE. Even with the GARVEE projects on I-84, if we don't put in U.S. 20/26 and Hwy 44, the system starts to shut down. And then you throw into the mix 3.1 million people. It is very beneficial to plan for the buildout to help identify what sort of illustrative transportation system we need to build, but we are dealing with the more immediate short term, 20 year planning horizon in *Communities in Motion*. The Five Year Transportation Program also is looking dire.

Dave Bieter asked for confirmation that the reason for *Communities in Motion* was because trend wasn't what was wanted.

Matt said the trend was looked at in the 20 year planning horizon in the transportation plan. Now we are looking at the buildout potential. That analysis has never been done before. The other disconnect is the Community Choices growth scenario and how does it fit into comp plan updates. The analysis being done now is looking at all the comp plans together and what they say is going to happen in the life of those plans.

Sally said the end goal is to tie back to adequate public facilities. The exercise in how to quantify comp plans goes down two paths. The first is, what will the Valley look like in 20-50 years, and what do we do today to address that, i.e., when we see a particular land use density we will understand what it means. What portion of that is in the 20 year horizon and how does it tie back to the CIP and if we are going to provide adequate public facilities? The task will set the stage for the next step toward adequate public facilities.

David Zarembo stated there is also a cost of doing nothing. When talking about trying to balance ITD and ACHD's budgets by not developing Hwy 44 or 20/26, goods and services have to be able to move and if we accept final gridlock, there is a cost to that. What we save by not widening 20/26 is not worth what we lose in the economics. So how do we quantify that? When we get to the adequate public facilities, what is the

cost of not doing this and how do we publicize it? If we are ever going to have the public will to find the money, we can't keep balancing the budget by not doing things. Somehow the public has to say, "We want to be able to get around and this should have been thought about 20 years ago." This is 20 years ago, and we need to be thinking about it now. What are people going to be saying 20-40 years from now about adequate public facilities? How do we justify what we have to spend today so that we are not immobile 20 years from now?

Elaine added that in addition to the cost of not doing anything, we need to begin to look at other ways besides road expansions and determine what the cost of each of those is, and then to begin to build public support around one of them based on lifestyle choices. Also, it would be helpful when working through the assumptions to make sure they are documented and put side by side with the model so it is a transparent process.

Matt stated that the documentation is going to be a workload issue for COMPASS staff and member agency staff. There has to be a commitment from member agencies' staff that they will document the data and information that they provide to COMPASS and ACHD's staff as the model is developed and refined.

David Bieter said the good news/ bad news part is that we are not growing at 4.4 percent. There is a unique opportunity to get this done and in place now during this slow down, but we need to get it done as soon as possible.

Carl Miller noted that the overall growth rate from last calendar year was at .8 percent.

Matt said if the elected officials say to get this accomplished in FY2009, we will make it happen. More time will need to be added to the FY2010 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget for COMPASS to facilitate BGG, as there isn't enough time budgeted now to do the technical analysis. Also member agencies will need to dedicate their staff time as well.

Dave Bieter asked if it was possible to get it done by the first of the year.

Sally said by the first of the year we will have the buildout quantification, the 20 year quantification, the methodology well defined, and the beginnings of a discussion about what are we going to do with the big buildout scenario.

Dave asked if the specifics of what we are going to implement under adequate public facilities is part of the discussion.

Sally said the specifics will need to follow after we have numbers together and see where we are. The initial discussion was to do more work around adequate public facilities concurrent with some of the comp plan quantification, but the work group felt that the first step was to get through quantification and understand what it really means and where we are going.

COMPASS needs to have the demographics done by July 2009 to stay on schedule with the update to *Communities in Motion*, that is why we started running two tracks. The schedule shows it running through September 2009, but it may not take that long.

Phil said once the base line is done, it would be an interesting analysis to see what would have to be done to the infrastructure to accommodate that end product, even though it may not be what we want. And to look at the alternatives as far as what the investment would need to be and where it would be coming from.

Sally agreed it would be an important discussion, but some further discussion about how adequate public facilities will function at a practical level needs to run parallel with that.

John Evans asked if we are running the parallel buildout scenarios with the presumption that we will have different numbers.

Sally replied that once we have the first cut, it will start the process of thinking about what options should be looked at and how to evaluate scenarios. Then we will have numbers that we are more confident about. If we go forward and not talk about buildout until we get the refined numbers, it will take it out of the *Communities in Motion* schedule.

Matt clarified that we are not talking about refining the gross numbers that have been approved by the COMPASS Board. We are talking about how the growth is allocated between comp plans into the traffic analysis zones. That is where we will get into more of a challenge in trying to document it in a way that will sustain a potential legal challenge, as opposed to the long range planning process where we are dealing with a grosser number and larger geographic area.

John Evans said it seemed to him that both consume quite a bit of effort. He asked if we are going through this effort with *Communities in Motion* and then are we going to do something else that is going to impact the work we have already done and maybe change it.

Matt replied it is more of a parallel effort. It is allowing *Communities in Motion's* part to go forward. The refining of the numbers at that lower level and getting into the details is the Blueprint process. We are acknowledging that may take longer to refine those numbers and information.

Charles noted if we were to refine the 3.1 million to 2.85 million, from a regional stand point it probably doesn't matter because either number is well over transportation capacity. At the micro level where decisions are being made, you could see a big swing on a particular intersection or stretch of street as to whether something would be conceivable or not. That is what we are expecting to see out of the refinement process.

Matt said to keep in mind that *Communities in Motion* is a 20 year window and we are constraining it to 2035, looking at finances and what sort of transportation system can be accomplished by that time frame. Buildout is not going to occur by 2035.

David Zaremba stated the reason he keeps talking about full buildout is that even looking at the 20 year plan we need to know how it fits into the end target, or as close to the end target as we can imagine, in order to know what should happen in the 20 year plan.

Matt replied that is why the gross buildout is supposed to be used for a preservation scenario for right-of-way. What is legally required is the 2035 plan, so we can continue the flow of money for operations and maintenance for both the roadway system and the public transportation system.

Elaine commented that while the federal requirement is the 20 year plan, we need to be careful even with that. What we are talking about is a plan that will fix, not in time, but by number, the number of people we are planning for. It is a projection that number of people will happen in 20 years, but it may not. The variable is the time we need to accumulate and spend the money to make the improvements. Over the last 30 years we have fallen behind because we have grown faster than, in most cases, what was projected. People get hung up on the 20 year number. If you grow too fast or too slow they say you have done a bad job. The big issue is if the money is available within the time period you need it.

Dave Bieter said it is vital in this downtime we get this done. We know what adequate public facilities are and that we have an implemented plan. This is a valuable process, but it won't be valuable if we don't get this done.

Matt stated the caution is, as we experienced in the 1980's with some of our member agencies, don't assume that down times are going to continue forever. Some of our road structures that are inadequately designed were based upon member agencies telling us that growth was not going to occur in an area, and not to allocate the population in that area in the traffic analysis zones. Also, projected growth at 7 percent or 12 percent or whatever continuing on forever is not realistic either. There will be variations over time.

Status Report Monitoring/Public Outreach Education

Matt noted that Deanna Smith had met with the COMPASS Public Participation Committee (PPC) and asked for input regarding the Power Point presentation on BGG. Deanne requested that PPC participate in the public outreach to the service groups to educate the public on what BGG is doing. Matt agreed that the committee should participate in that process, but to make sure that what they do is tied into *Communities in Motion*.

Area of Impact

Anna Canning recapped the work group's efforts on the Area of Impact amendment process. Anna stated the goal is to develop a menu of potential items to include in Title 9 Agreements that are agreeable to the County. Title 9 is the County's implementing ordinance for Area of Impact agreements. Each city has its own chapter within Title 9. The committee's proposal is that each city would work with Ada County to adopt a new Title 9 agreement based on this new format at roughly the same time later this year.

Fred Tilman expressed his frustration that the Ada County Commission has not been briefed on the proposed amendment process when it is their decision to make.

Anna said that an application would be submitted, just like any other Title 9 agreement change, and the Ada County Commission would have the final say. The Work Group hoped to get permission from the Commission to have Ada County's lead staff come up with the language.

Fred said it was fine for the Work Group to go ahead and do what it is doing. Fred asked who would be bringing the change in the County's ordinance to the Ada County Commissioners.

Anna replied that it specifically says in Title 9 that the cities can request an amendment to their chapter in Title 9. So, each city will ask for an amendment to their chapter.

Elaine said that she would meet with Boise staff to go over some other ideas about things they can include. Dave Bieter agreed that should be done.

III. Other Items

Sally asked if it would be beneficial for the BGG Steering/Technical Committee to brief each of the individual city councils on the work being done.

David Zaremba agreed that would be beneficial as part of a regular city council agenda so the public can attend.

Matt Stoll asked if a formal request would be coming to add more time in the FY2010 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget for technical analysis by COMPASS staff.

Elaine Clegg asked for unanimous request for the BGG Chair to submit a request to amend the FY2010 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget. Hearing no objection, Chair Bieter so ordered.

Matt asked if there is an issue with closing the BGG bank account. There is a monthly fee associated with the account and the current balance is \$34. Should the nonprofit status be kept as well?

Chair Bieter directed staff to put the discussion of the bank account and whether to maintain the nonprofit status on the September 2009 Consortium agenda.

IV. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Consortium is September 10, 2009, at COMPASS from 1:30 to 3:30 pm.

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Consortium\minutes\consort_minutes061109.doc

**BGG Consortium Committee Meeting
SIGN-IN SHEET**

Date: June 11, 2008

Name	Representing	Phone #
1. DAVID ZAREMBA	MERIDIAN FOR MAYOR DEWEED	288-2935
2. NATHAN MITCHELL	STAR	941-2688
3. JAKE BANTON	EAGLE	
4. (Katie Pruitt)	Boise	
5. Matt Stoll	COMPASS	
6. John Evans	Garden City	
7. Ernie Clegg	City of Boise	
8. Sally Goodell	Carol McKee	
9. Patricia Nilsson	City of Boise	384-3842
10. CALEB HOOD	Meridian	884-5533
11. Mark Tate	M3	939-6263
12. Charles Trainor	COMPASS	855-2558
13. RAY STARK	Chamber of Commerce	
14. ANNA GANNING	CITY OF MERIDIAN	884-5533
15. Mary May	M3	939-6263
16. Scott Gunnsey	FTD	334 8303
17. Nancy Brechly	COMPASS	
18. Amy left	COMPASS	
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		
23.		
24.		

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium

FROM: Deanna Smith, Subcommittee Chair

DATE: September 2, 2009

RE: **Blueprint Steering Committee, Monitoring and Public Outreach & Education Subcommittee Report**

The subcommittee met on August 20th and developed the following recommendations which were presented to the Blueprint Steering Committee. The Steering Committee approved these at their August 27th meeting. We ask the Consortium for its consideration of and support for these two recommendations.

For the successful implementation of Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG) and Communities in Motion (CIM) we should include BGG in the monitoring of CIM, and we need to continue educating our residents about the importance of regional cooperation on transportation and land use planning to the success development of all Treasure Valley communities.

1. We recommend the subcommittee and staff work with the Public Participation Committee (PPC) to update the Power Point presentation originally developed with the assistance of Doherty and Associates as an outreach tool. And that staff and the subcommittee work with the PPC to do this public outreach. Similar to the assistance PPC is currently providing to staff for the CIM outreach. This presentation will also be used internally for newly elected officials and staff who may not know the history of BGG and CIM in an annual presentation for anyone interested in learning this background. It will be updated annually and also provide a tool to help monitor our progress on implementation of BGG.
2. The update of CIM provides an excellent opportunity to continue to help people understand the important link between land use and transportation, and since BGG is the land use policy guide for CIM in Ada County we recommend that some level of information about BGG be included in the CIM update.

We recognize this presents a bit of a challenge, given that BGG covers only one county only while CIM covers more than one County, none-the-less the land use and transportation connection is important everywhere. The subcommittee will work with the PPC and staff to develop some low level inclusion of BGG in the CIM update.

Update on Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Work For 9/10/09 Consortium Meeting

Overview

The Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Accounting Work Group has been working with the County, Cities and COMPASS to quantify comprehensive plans at build out. The purpose is to develop a methodology for quantifying comprehensive plans to determine how to align the comprehensive and transportation plans. The build out scenario estimates about 3 million people in the valley. Using a range of possible growth rates (2 to 4 percent) it will take 50 to 75 years to achieve this level of growth – significantly beyond any current transportation planning process.

- Build out analysis can inform the long range planning process to help understand future transportation needs, develop long term transportation strategies and define future corridor preservation needs. This discussion goes beyond that required for the cumulative impacts and adequate public facilities analysis, which is the scope of the current Steering/Technical Committee assignment.
- The methods being developed for quantifying comprehensive plans will assist with cumulative impacts and adequate public facilities analysis.

Status of Methodology Development

The Cities, County and COMPASS have taken a first cut at quantifying the comprehensive plans. The process identified several areas that warrant additional work. Examples include:

- How to estimate the housing/commercial ratio in areas mapped as mixed use.
- Where is redevelopment likely to occur?

The parties are planning a detailed review of the estimates in September, with the goal of having a completed estimate, and detailed documentation of the methods by mid-October. This fall, the Work Group will outline how cumulative impacts analysis can be considered and reported, leading to discussion of adequate public facilities methods, likely early in 2010.

Status of the Build Out Scenario

At the August 20, 2009 Steering/Technical Committee meeting the members agreed that further discussion of the build out scenario is not within the charge of the Adequate Public Facilities Work Group. The Steering/Technical Committee recommends that two steps be completed by the Steering/Technical Committee before bringing further discussion to the Consortium. These are:

1. Member staff and COMPASS will complete a detailed review of the comprehensive plan quantification methods and outcomes in September/October 2009.
2. The Steering/Technical Committee requests that the Consortium also direct the Committee to review the results of modeling analysis of the build out scenario and prepare for a policy discussion with the Consortium, likely in December 2009.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium
FROM: Charles Trainor, Director of Planning
DATE: September 4, 2009
RE: Comprehensive Plan Buildout Analysis – Comparison with Other Regions

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and discussion.

BACKGROUND:

Over the past several months, COMPASS staff have been working with local agencies to prepare a buildout analysis of the area's comprehensive plan. Carl Miller, MaryAnn Waldinger, Ross Dodge and Eric Adolfson have put in many, many hours to make the analysis as rational as possible. The process used data from a variety of sources, information regarding densities and plan interpretation from local staff. The result indicated a potential buildout at 1.1 million households and 3 million people.

COMPASS staff worked with local jurisdictions to quantify each comprehensive plan's land use in terms of households, population and jobs (retail, office, manufacturing, government, other). Discussions with member agency staff led to developing two build out scenarios – one scenario took into account existing development and the other scenario assumed existing development would redevelop at comp plan densities.

Build Out Existing. This scenario allocated growth to vacant and redevelopable land at the plan densities by land use type. It resulted in a population of 3 million for the two-county area. COMPASS staff received direction from the BGG Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Accounting Work Group in July that the broad methodology would be acceptable for use in creating a build-out analysis for consideration in the *Communities in Motion* (CIM) Update but additional refinements would be needed before the build-out could be used for adequate public facilities purposes.

Based on an annual growth rate of 2.4%, it would take about 70 years to reach 3 million people.

Build Out Zero Base. This scenario allocated growth to all land at the plan densities by land use type. Essentially, it assumes every parcel today redevelops according to the comp plan regardless of current use. This resulted in a population of 3.7 million for the two-county area.

COMPASS staff tested both of the build out scenarios in the regional travel demand model. Transportation system assumptions included the roadway projects listed in CIM (funded and illustrative) and the funded transit system (similar to today). The use of this transportation network was intended as a first draft for informational purposes only.

STATUS:

One of the challenges in testing such large increases in population and employment is the limited transportation supply. Even the full transportation network represented in CIM is not adequate to provide for a population of 3 million. This presents a challenge in terms of determining "adequate" public facilities. Virtually every major road would need to carry traffic far exceeding any planned capacity.

This future might seem impossible. Yet other regions have addressed such growth, and many are still seen as livable places. The Steering Committee requested a comparison to larger regions. (See attached tables,) Some of these are at or near 3 million today. All but Tucson, AZ are more than 1 million in their larger region.

The attached tables show the type of freeway and transit investment these regions have made to provide for growth. They provide nearly 52 freeway lane miles per 10,000 people and 108,400 miles of bus revenue service at a cost of \$150,100 per 10,000 people. How does this stack up to what we provide in the region today? The following table shows the general magnitude of transportation service for a region of three million. The average is based on the larger comparison regions. The low number is based on the lowest factor drawn from the comparison regions.

	Boise Valley 2007 580,000	Boise Valley "Needs" Buildout 3,010,000	
		Average	Low
Freeway Lane Miles	181	1,560	1,270
Bus Revenue Miles	1,307,676	32,202,200	21,136,800
Bus Operating Cost	\$6,754,806	\$222,740,000	\$170,790,000
Rail Operating Cost	N.A.	\$68,060,000	\$45,190,000

This information can be useful in considering very long-term transportation goals for the region. If additional freeway capacity is needed, where should these be? How does this affect the planning for the Kuna Mora and McDermott corridors? What is the tie-in with the Western Canyon Arterial Study? Are there other corridors that need evaluation as long-term major routes?

COMPASS staff is also working on arterial road information for these comparison regions. Obtaining the lane mile information for arterials has been more difficult. When completed this information will also be presented to the Consortium.

The transit implications are also strong. While not all the comparison regions are now providing rail services, they are making major investments in transit. Austin, Phoenix and Las Vegas are planning for rail. Bus rapid transit facilities are also being implemented in most of these regions.

Attachment - 1

CT: T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Comp Plan Buildout\consortium mmo sep2009.docx
pc: File 761

COMPARISON METROPOLITAN AREAS - FREEWAYS

2007 Data for Urbanized Area	Population	Freeway Lane Miles	Freeway Lane Miles per 100k population	Maximum Daily Freeway Volume
Austin, TX	851,000	567	66.6	330,000
Denver, CO	2,184,000	1,279	58.6	236,364
Las Vegas, NV	992,000	570	57.5	256,000
Sacramento, CA	1,858,000	824	44.3	224,000
Salt Lake City/Ogden, UT	1,448,000	850	58.7	252,679
Phoenix, AZ	3,459,000	1,549	44.8	281,000
Tucson, AZ	589,000	248	42.1	169,000
Average			51.7	
Reno, NV	294,000	237	80.6	159,000
Boise Valley	406,000	181	44.6	126,665

Source: Bureau of Transportation Statistics

http://www.bts.gov/publications/state_transportation_statistics/state_transportation_statistics_2007/index.html

COMPARISON METROPOLITAN AREAS - TRANSIT

2007 Metropolitan Area	Population - Service Area	Revenue Miles Bus/100k population	Operating Expense Bus/100k population	Operating Expense Rail/100k population
Austin, TX	1,012,638	1,358,352	\$10,595,375	\$0
Denver, CO	2,619,000	1,474,217	\$10,159,324	\$1,546,408
Las Vegas, NV	1,969,658	848,260	\$5,674,193	\$2,725,800
Sacramento, CA	1,087,671	702,218	\$7,563,645	\$4,360,147
Salt Lake City/Ogden, UT	1,744,417	956,775	\$5,920,296	\$1,501,414
Phoenix, AZ	3,072,149	922,218	\$5,760,034	\$0
Tucson, AZ	532,000	1,325,150	\$8,112,503	\$0
Average		1,069,841	7,400,065	\$2,2621,30
Reno, NV	319,977	1,124,000	\$8,290,487	
Boise Valley	272,625	479,661	\$2,477,691	

Source: National Transit Database for 2007

<http://204.68.195.57/ntdprogram/data.htm>

Note: Population differences between the two tables are due to differences in the geographies used. The freeway information is based on urbanized area boundaries defined by the 2000 Census. Transit information is based on service areas defined by the transit provider for each region.

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Comp Plan Buildout\table for memo.docx

COMPARISON METROPOLITAN AREAS - ROADWAYS

2007 Data for Urbanized Area	Population	Freeway Lane Miles	Freeway Lane Miles per 10k population	Maximum Daily Freeway Volume
Austin, TX	851,000	567	66.6	330,000
Denver, CO	2,184,000	1,279	58.6	236,364
Las Vegas, NV	992,000	570	57.5	256,000
Sacramento, CA	1,858,000	824	44.3	224,000
Salt Lake City + Ogden	1,448,000	850	58.7	252,679
Phoenix	3,459,000	1,549	44.8	281,000
Tucson	589,000	248	42.1	169,000
Average			51.7	Average
Reno	294,000	237	80.6	159,000
Boise + Nampa	406,000	181		126,665

Source: Bureau of Transportation Statistics

http://www.bts.gov/publications/state_transportation_statistics/state_transportation_statistics_2007/index.html

COMPARISON METROPOLITAN AREAS - TRANSIT

2007 Metropolitan Area	Population - Service Area	Revenue Miles Bus/10k population	Operating Expense Bus/10k population	Operating Expense Rail/10k population
Austin - Round Rock, TX	1,012,638	135,835	\$1,059,537	\$0
Denver, CO	2,619,000	147,422	\$1,015,932	\$154,641
Las Vegas, NV	1,969,658	84,826	\$567,419	\$272,580
Sacramento, CA	1,087,671	70,222	\$756,364	\$436,015
Salt Lake City - Ogden	1,744,417	95,677	\$592,030	\$150,141
Phoenix	3,072,149	92,222	\$576,003	\$0
Tucson	532,000	132,515	\$811,250	\$0
Average		108,388	768,362	
Reno	319,977	112,400	\$829,049	
COMPASS (Boise - Nampa)	272,625	47,966	\$247,769	

Source: National Transit Database for 2007

<http://204.68.195.57/ntdprogram/data.htm>