



Hamilton Area Transportation Plan 2009 Update

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Notes September 21, 2009 – Meeting Number 4

Introduction

The fourth Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting for the Hamilton Area Transportation Plan (2009 Update) project was held on Monday, September 21, 2009, from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm at City Hall. The purpose of the meeting was to continue CAC involvement on the project, and to more specifically discuss the retail and non-retail job projections and assignments. The opportunity was taken to also begin the discussion about transportation impact fees. A short video on modern roundabouts was also viewed. The following CAC members were present for this fourth meeting:

- Ron Ehli (Chief, Hamilton Fire Department)
- Chip Pigman (Pigman Builders)
- Kelly Hudson (Rocky Mountain Laboratories)
- Dennis Stranger (Project Manager City of Hamilton)
- Ann Harding (Interested Citizen)
- Dan Rothlisberger (Interested Citizen)

CAC members that were not able to attend due to previously scheduled commitments were Lance Pysher, Kathleen Driscoll, Al Mitchell, Joanne Verwolf, Steve Powell, and Robin Pruitt. Note that an email from Robin Pruitt prior to the meeting stated that she would not be able to participate in the project CAC from this point forward. In addition, the following non-CAC members were in attendance:

- Mary Miller (Interested Citizen)
- Sheila Ludlow (Montana Department of Transportation - Helena)
- Shane Stack (Montana Department of Transportation – Missoula)
- Dan Harmon (HDR Engineering)

The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Key, CDM's project manager.

Discussion Items

The majority of the meeting was spent discussing the retail and non-retail job assignments made by CDM out to the planning horizon year (year 2030). Jeff summarized the methodology used to arrive at the total job forecasts between the year 2010 and the year 2030. The methodology was as described in the *Socio-economic Data, Growth Trends and Land Use Assignments Technical Memorandum* submitted a week before the meeting. The results of the discussion led to a general agreement that the projections seem reasonable for this planning level document, and the job forecasts seem to be spread out over the relevant areas anticipated for growth - with appropriate allowance for in-fill development.

Jeff then started a discussion about transportation impact fees. This discussion was intended to expose the group to impact fees and the relevant legislation that allows communities to implement the fees. The relevant legislation was modified via Senate Bill 85 during the 2005 legislature. The revisions to the law heightened the level of documentation required for communities to pursue this funding strategy. To that end, much of the documentation required to be in compliance with the legislation will be found in the Transportation Plan document. CDM will structure the document to be in compliance with the legislative requirements for documentation, such that the City or County can initiate a *Transportation Impact Fee Study* at a later time.

Lastly, the group watched a short video on modern roundabouts that was published by the Washington Department of Transportation. After the video, the group discussed the advantages and disadvantages of modern roundabouts. There were mixed opinions on whether a suitable location currently exists within the planning area for this type of intersection treatment. Jeff stated that he did not have any locations identified as a candidate for a modern roundabout, however he likes to show this video on all transportation planning projects to expose the committee to this type of intersection treatment.

The following bullets contain specific items that were discussed during the meeting.

- There was a general discussion about the forecasted dwelling units made in the submitted memorandum and that the sustainability of new construction on a yearly basis seems low when compared to the historical rate of new building permits building over the past decade. There was some skepticism whether this was accurate or not. Jeff and Dennis explained the dwelling unit forecasting procedure made through the recently adopted *Growth Policy Update (2009)* and how those forecasts were made. Jeff stated that he would confirm the numbers with the Growth Policy consultant (Kate McMahon of Applied Communications), however the data represented came straight from the *Growth Policy Update* and is being used for several area planning documents at the present time.
- Regarding impact fees, several comments were made:
 - It was expressed that hopefully the Plan can ascertain whether one service area or more than one service area should be used in the pending Transportation Impact Fee Study Update. Jeff stated that it is his hope that once model results become available, that there will be a clear distinction as to what areas will need improvements and what areas will not. Accordingly, it is hoped that service areas will be clearly defined and documented.

- It was also discussed that it is important to show the nexus between the collection of impact fees, the need for impact fees and the expenditure of impact fees for a given area. This is a clear requirement of Senate Bill 85.
- It was discussed that the impact fees assessments, whenever they are revisited, should not be overly complex or burdensome. For example, a single rate may be desirable, or perhaps a single rate for residential and single rate for non-residential. Caution was expressed about having impact fees for multiple land use categories as typically defined in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*.

Conclusion & Action Items

The next meeting of the CAC (meeting number 5) is scheduled for Monday, November 2nd, 2009 from 6:00 to 8:00 pm. The location will be at City Hall.