

Consortium Member Agency Meeting
Thursday, June 8, 2006 2:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M.
Ada County Highway District Auditorium

AGENDA

I. Consent Agenda

- a. Approval of the May 4 Meeting Notes (pg. 2-9)

II. Action

a. **Steering Committee Status and Recommendations (pg. 10-28)**

Action Item: The Consortium will be requested to direct the project consultants to conduct focus group sessions about the draft BGG plan in mid-July. ULI and Idaho Smart Growth are also expected to have sessions about the plan in mid-July. **Update Item:** Michael Lauer will review the Steering Committee Recommendations (refer to attachments).

b. **Cancellation of July 6 meeting**

Action Item: The Consortium should consider canceling its previously scheduled July 6 meeting. If the focus group sessions are approved in Item II a, there will be no need for the Consortium to meet until after these sessions are conducted. The next meeting of the Consortium would then be August 3.

c. **Intergovernmental Agency Agreement (distributed separately prior to the meeting)**

III. Information

- a. Project Coordinator's Report (pg. 29-30)

- b. Funding Status (pg. 31-21)

BGG Funding Committee meeting immediately following Consortium meeting.

Remaining 2006 Consortium meetings are as follows:
July 6, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, Meridian Police Department (see Item IIb)
August 3, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, location to be determined
September 7, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, location to be determined
October 5, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, location to be determined
November 2, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, location to be determined
December 7, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, location to be determined

Blueprint for Good Growth - c/o Doherty & Associates – 575 E. Parkcenter Blvd, Suite 200 - Boise, ID 83706
Business (208) 336-0420 - Fax (208) 336-2407 – Email kdoherly@dohertyeng.com
www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com



Countywide Land Use and Transportation Guide Plan

Meeting Minutes

**Consortium Meeting – Meridian Police Department
Thursday, May 4, 2006 2:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M.**

Attendees:

Phil Bandy, Councilmember, City of Eagle
David Bieter, Mayor, City of Boise *
Tammy de Weerd, Mayor, City of Meridian*
John Evans, Mayor, Garden City*
John Franden, President, ACHD *
Maryanne Jordan, Councilmember, City of Boise
Carol A. McKee, Commissioner, ACHD
Nancy Merrill, Mayor, City of Eagle *
Judy Peavey-Derr, Commissioner, Ada County
Diana Sanders, City of Kuna *
Rick Yzaguirre, Commissioner, Ada County *

Others:

Gerry Armstrong, Ada County
Karen Doherty, Doherty & Associates
Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
Pete Friedman, Ada County
Michael Lauer, Planning Works
Kent McCarthy, Idaho Power
Deanna Smith, Idaho Smart Growth
Charles Trainor, COMPASS
Bob Taunton, SunCor

President Bieter called the meeting to order at 2:10 P.M. Official delegates are noted with a * in the attendee listing.

CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Approval of the April 6 Meeting Notes**
Consent agenda approved.

ACTION ITEMS

a. Steering Committee Status Report and Revised Recommendations

Michael Lauer reviewed the Steering Committee's recommendations from their April 20 meeting. The committee recommended significant changes to the scope of the Blueprint including elimination of objectives and policies which are not directly related to coordination of land use and public facility decisions. They also recommended an addition of a new section of recommended growth management policies consistent with the Committee's "Guiding Policies". The Consortium agreed with these recommendations.

The pending issue of rural tier character was discussed. A key question is should the rural tier be an area that should remain rural in character for the foreseeable future or should the rural tier be a holding area for future urbanization?

Michael said BGG policies do currently address future urbanization of the rural tier through:

- Expansion of Areas of Impact
- Adequate Facilities Policies
- Consistency Policies
- Planned Community Development (Pete Friedman/Ada County will send CDs of the Ada County Open Space PowerPoint to all of the Cities.)

Mayor Merrill suggested we need to address some questions regarding the rural tier such as economics and transfer of development rights. Michael noted that the Steering Committee has addressed equity in this area for economics. He indicated the Steering Committee has thought the future of large scale agriculture is limited in Ada County.

Mayor Bieter thought calling the rural tier a holding area would be inviting speculation and "fueling the frenzy."

Correspondence from Councilmember Clegg regarding the issue was distributed and is attached.

Commissioner Peavey-Derr asked if there was a taking issue – we need to make sure we provide equity if development is precluded for the sake of open space.

Mayor Evans expressed that a major decision point is regarding 20-year Area of Impact (AOI) - the jurisdictions all need to agree on how much

growth will occur in this 20-year horizon. He questioned how much of the land is left over after the AOIs are adjusted to meet a 20 year horizon? Michael noted that each city has the capacity within their current plans to accommodate the projected 20-year growth. Michael indicated the objective of the plan was to grow in an efficient manner and changes in growth may reduce the amount of land that is consumed in new growth.

Michael indicated that the planned communities were suggested in the AOI by the Steering Committee. Mayor de Weerd was concerned about the melding of Planned Communities and removing the buffer between cities.

Councilmember Jordan thought Planned Communities should be reviewed at both in the AOI and at the rural locations (intended to be new towns).

Mayor de Weerd would like to see the use of TDRs fleshed out. Michael indicated that the TDRs need a market for the development rights and planned communities could be that market.

The Consortium determined the rural tier should be an area that should remain rural in character for the foreseeable future by a vote of 6 affirmative and 1 opposition. Rural character is loosely defined as developed with current development rights in the rural tier.

Mayor de Weerd suggested a MOU be drafted limiting jurisdiction growth to inside the Area of Impact. Michael noted that Eagle had clarified this regarding annexation. Mayor Bieter indicated this MOU must be predicated by adequate public facilities in the Area of Impact.

Mayor Merrill indicated there may be some upcoming State legislation to address Area of Impact boundary adjustment. They are working with the AIC and Association of Counties to develop this legislation.

Other update from Steering Committee was presented by Michael Lauer as follows:

- Modify the actions under policy GM-16 to replace “with written consent from the city in the form of a” with “subject to execution of a” so that actions of the County in areas of impact require the agreement of the property owner rather than formal city consent.
- Retain policy GM-25 as amended to insert provisions for reviewing BGG, County and City policies if planned communities located outside areas of impact constitute more than a threshold percentage of newly platted lots in any given year. (note that the Steering Committee will vote

on a motion to reduce the percentage from 10 to 8 at their May 5 meeting.)

- Omit the pending policy addressing sliding scale density bonuses for rural tier conservation subdivision development.
- Adjust policy GM-33 to reflect the lack of certainty about the specific type of high capacity transit service along the State Street, Chinden Boulevard and rail corridors.
- Replace the open space and natural resource goal, objective and policy with strong recommendations for local actions to carry out the BGG guiding principles.
- As a first step toward ensuring the adequacy of schools, local governments should ensure that enough land is preserved for future school sites.

b. Presentation on the Implications of School Concurrency

Michael introduced this topic by reviewing the Adequate Public Facilities (APF) as follows:

An (APF is) requirement that

- Specified public facilities and services
- In defined areas
- Are available
- At the adopted level of service standard
- At the time that the impacts of development will be felt
- So that adopted levels of service are maintained.

APF is not

- Rezoning or down zoning of property
- Exaction/dedication requirements
- Impact fees
- Moratoria

APF in the plan currently includes

- Transportation
- Water
- Sewer
- Stormwater
- Schools
- Fire Protection

The only way APFs can be applied is in conjunction with a capital improvements plan with an ultimate goal to provide a reasonable amount of capacity. A developer can suggest mitigation to meet the APF requirements; the service provider must agree to the mitigation

volunteered. Kelli Fairless clarified that capital improvements volunteered by the developers must be accepted by the jurisdictions.

The group discussed APF implementation considerations. Michael noted the following considerations:

- Areas of applicability/service areas
- Public Facilities included
- Level of Service (LOS) standards
- Current and projected capacities
- Types of applicable development
- Timing of determination
- Effect of failure to meet LOS
- Allocating/monitoring capacity

Michael noted that incremental formation of APFs are often utilized, transportation is usually being the initial requirement. Michael thought this incremental implementation would work well for the jurisdictions in Ada County.

School facility APFs were discussed next.

School capacity is impacted by the following:

- Permanent classroom capacity
- Impacts of class size
- Core facilities
- Programmatic/operational adjustments
 - Split sessions
 - Year around schools
 - Floating teachers – utilizes vacant rooms instead of a dedicated classroom
- Role of portable buildings

Michael suggested removing private and charter schools from the APF discussions and focusing on public schools. He noted that, when setting LOS standards for schools, we must:

- Define capacity
- Allow for programmatic adjustments
- Plug into financially feasible capital facilities plan
- Evaluate ability to achieve desired LOS with available funds.

Mayor Evans asked about the disparity that may occur between Ada County and Canyon, Gem, and Elmore counties if the requirements for development in Ada County is more rigorous. He questioned if we pushing development away from Ada County by implementing APFs?

Michael indicated this is an argument raised in many communities but is often unfounded.

Michael asked if the Consortium still agreed with putting schools in the APF arena for the BGG Plan. Mayor Merrill wants the Steering Committee to look at the relationship of schools and transportation, including walkability and transportation of students and teachers to schools. Consortium seemed to be in favor of keeping the schools in the APFs in the way defined by Lauer.

de Weerd indicated she is looking forward to the APFs and appreciated the concurrency discussion.

c. Commitment to the BGG Plan as requested at the end of April

Michael indicated two responses were received (Eagle and Garden City). Those responses were mainly clarifications in the text.

Michael asked about the other responses. Bieter and de Weerd indicated that their silence should be taken as affirming the commitment. Boise will send a formal response. Ada County indicated verbally that they agree to the commitments.

d. Project Coordinator's Report

The Consortium approved a supplemental agreement of \$85,000 for Doherty & Associates. This supplemental agreement includes \$45,000 for additional labor and direct expenses incurred through May 5, 2006 and \$40,000 for continued project coordination services between June 1, 2006 and December 31, 2006.

e. Intergovernmental Agency Agreement Update

Steve Price is working on these agreements and should have them ready for the next Consortium meeting.

INFORMATION

f. Funding Status

The funding committee renewed its efforts to raise money for the BGG project. The deficit is approximately \$304,000.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 P.M.



City Council

04 May 2006

President

Maryanne Jordan

Council ProTem

Elaine Clegg

Vernon L. Bisterfeldt

David Eberle

Alan W. Shealy

Jim Tibbs

Boise City Hall

Third Floor

150 N. Capitol Blvd.

Mailing Address

P. O. Box 500

Boise, ID 83701-0500

Phone

208/384-4410

Fax

208/433-5613

TDD/TTY

800/377-3529

Web

www.cityofboise.org

citycouncil@cityofboise.org

Dear Consortium Members,

I am sorry that I cannot be at the meeting today. I believe that the decisions before the Consortium today are the most important decisions this valley will face on the issues of development for the foreseeable future and felt a need to share my position on that decision even though I am unable to be there.

The question: "Should the rural tier be an area that should remain rural in character for the foreseeable future OR Should the rural tier be a holding area for future urbanization?" should not have to be asked. It was answered with a strong affirmative for the first option by a nearly every participant in the public process that was used to develop the Community Choices scenario. The rural tier can and should remain rural in character for the foreseeable future (which I define as for the length of this plan – 25 years). To do otherwise would be to abdicate our responsibility to leave our children and grandchildren a region whose future is bright.

We heard at the Leadership Conference from a representative of Phoenix that by developing every square inch of their farmland and now developing environmentally sensitive areas of their desert, they have tipped the balance in Phoenix. People no longer view it as a desirable place to stay, or a place they want to move to. More people are leaving Phoenix than are coming. If we wait until that same tipping point in the Treasure Valley before we take action we will reach the same future and the tide of developing this valley from one end to the other with no open space left will destroy our future livability.

More people will eventually conclude that this is a place to leave than will want to come here. With a future economy dependent on building the kind of place that people desire to come to we will lose our economic advantage of being a great place. The people who are leaving Phoenix may be choosing Boise today because it is still a great place. Those same people will have no loyalty to staying here if we mess this place up as well.

I've been told that it is inevitable that we fill every square inch of the valley with development and I that I shouldn't try to fight it. I can't follow that advice. I don't think it is inevitable and if I don't try to fight for what I passionately believe is a better future for my grandchildren I will always feel as if I have failed to live up to my responsibility to protect that future. The Treasure Valley has always touted itself as a place that is different

from everywhere else. If we want to be able to claim that in the future then we should be compelled to support a different outcome rather than giving in to what we're told is inevitable.

My position is not a radical or an unsupported position. Jim Heid of Urban Green also spoke to us at the Leadership Conference. He talked about Planned Communities and what makes them a good thing. In his working paper of planned communities he states that there are three prerequisites to sprawl-free greenfield development. And he says that all three of these must be met to ensure the success of a region as measured by high livability. The first of these prerequisites is Green Infrastructure.

I quote Heid from his paper "Although road congestion probably tops lost open space as a sprawl complaint, resolving both issues depends on first defining **where greenfield development should and should not go. Where should we build and more importantly where should we not build?**" (emphasis added). If we fail to designate any place as off limits to development we will not meet the first prerequisite that Heid contends is necessary to protect the livability of our region. The ULI panel that advised us last year said essentially the same thing.

I propose that we answer the question before us to day with the same strong affirmative that the public answered with. **The rural tier should remain rural in character for the foreseeable future.** To do otherwise would indeed abdicate our obligation to future generations to protect what is best about this valley. Please support me in protecting the very thing that makes this a 'great place.

Respectfully,



Elaine M. Clegg

Memo



To: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium
From: Michael Lauer, AICP
Date: June 1, 2006
Re: Status Report from Steering Committee

The Blueprint for Good Growth (Blueprint) Steering Committee unanimously recommended the adoption and implementation of the attached goals, objectives and policies, with the following exceptions:

GM-22: Limit development in the rural tier to an average of three percent (3%) of projected county-wide population growth within any three-year period, exclusive of development approved within a planned community. This limitation should be based on new lot creation and, if the County approves preliminary plats including enough new lots in the rural tier to equal three percent (3%) of all lots approved in preliminary plats throughout all tiers in the County within any three year period, subdivision action shall be deferred until the following year in accordance with adopted County standards.

Dissent: The two County representatives and one of the developer representatives voted to oppose the three percent cap on preliminary plats in the rural tier. The County's representatives stated that they preferred the five percent cap previously supported by the Steering Committee. The developer's representative stated that he could support the three percent cap if it excluded conservation subdivisions.

GM-24: Subject to the policies of this section, comprehensive plan consistency and compliance with applicable development regulations, encourage planned communities to be established within cities and areas of impact and allow for planned communities in rural areas of the County. If the total number of lots platted within the rural tier plus the lots platted in all planned communities located outside of an area of impact exceeds seven percent (7%) of the total lots receiving final plat approval throughout the county for any and given year, then the Blueprint Consortium will evaluate plan policies and regulations to assess the need for modifications to encourage more infill development.

Dissent: The two County representatives and one of the developer representatives voted to oppose the 7% threshold for reexamining growth policies because they felt that number of planned communities already being planned, in addition to other rural development will exceed 7% of total final plat activity. Note: those supporting the vote emphasized that the 7% would exclude planned communities located within the soon-to-be enlarged areas of impact.

Next Steps

No action by the Consortium is required at the June meeting. If acceptable to the Consortium, the Blueprint consultant team will proceed with the following in June:

1. schedule meetings with the project's original focus groups;
2. schedule meetings with the Chamber, Idaho Smart Growth and ULI representatives;
and
3. coordinate with the technical advisory committee on completion of Phase II tasks.

II. Blueprint Goals, Objectives & Policies

A. Growth Management

This section establishes the framework for management of growth through coordinated decisions that are consistent with the guiding principles established above. Objectives and policies in this section identify growth tiers, the targeted proportion of growth to occur in each tier and conditions applicable to development in each tier. Additionally, this section outlines areas to improve coordination between participating agencies and addresses the timing/phasing of development in relation to the availability of adequate public facilities and services.

Growth Tiers Defined

Map 1 establishes a variety of growth tiers covering Ada County. The growth tiers described below define areas with different development opportunities and policies which are defined in this plan.

Activity Centers

This tier includes commercial and mixed use development at various scales and intensities of development that serve neighborhoods, communities and the region. Most neighborhood activity centers, and all community and regional activity centers should be designed to support access by transit services as well as other modes of transportation. Standards for each of these centers shall be established within each community's land development regulations.

- **Neighborhood activity centers**, which are not shown in **Map 1**, serve one or more neighborhoods and are characterized by relatively small scale retail and service uses that may include mixed use or attached housing opportunities. These centers are characterized by designs and scales that support pedestrian access from adjacent neighborhoods. [e.g., 16th and State Street, and 8th and Fort in Boise]
- **Community activity centers** meet the needs of a group of neighborhoods or the entire community. These are characterized by shopping centers that include grocery stores as anchors, moderate to high density housing housing, office and service uses and mixed-use or multiple-use development. [insert local examples]
- **Regional activity centers** meet the needs of one or more community and include large scale employment and retail uses, high density residential development and mixed use projects that draw business from throughout the Treasure Valley. [e.g., Downtown Boise, insert local examples]

Areas of Impact

These areas are adjacent to incorporated cities and reflect an area that could reasonably be expected to be annexed and to be served by centralized sewer service within the next twenty years. Some rural residential development that does not receive centralized sewer service may be included within areas of impact in accordance with the applicable municipality's comprehensive plan. The primary purposes of areas of impact are to:

- Protect future city growth areas from inappropriate development that would constrain future growth;
- Facilitate coordinated land use and facility planning so service providers can better anticipate and plan to meet future demands;
- Provide a predictable framework for private development decisions;
- Provide for orderly and sequenced annexations and to reduce pressure for rapid area of impact boundary adjustments to encompass short-term annexation plans; and
- Ensure financial and physical capability to provide needed public facilities and services.

Cities

This tier includes currently incorporated municipalities and will be modified to reflect future annexations and incorporations.

Rural Tier

This tier includes all unincorporated land that is not located within an area of impact or approved planned community.

Planned Communities

This tier includes planned communities that are located outside an area of impact. The planned community tier should change to reflect the boundaries of planned communities approved through the County's comprehensive plan and planned community zoning processes. Note that this plan encourages development of planned communities and developments that include the characteristics of planned communities within areas of impact and cities.

Public Lands

This tier includes lands owned by a federal, state or local governmental agency.

Transit Corridors

This tier includes lands along existing or planned high volume transit routes that may be served by buses, bus rapid transit (BRT) a fixed guideway system (e.g., commuter rail or light rail). Also included in this tier are the primary bus routes that follow many of the County's arterial streets. Note that the type of service to be provided will depend on the mix, intensity and design of uses along the corridors. The highest volume transit services will follow those routes with the greatest potential ridership as measured by the amount of transit-supportive development and the level of transit dependency along the routes.

Growth Management Goal, Objective and Policies:

Goal: To establish and maintain sustainable development patterns that foster a high quality of life in Ada County.

Comment: *Quality of life is defined by the guiding principles and subsequent policies. While these policies also more fully define what is meant by sustainable development patterns, generally sustainability means that development will result in:*

- **A Healthy Economy**, with sustainable jobs and businesses that develop and nurture the local work force, where decision-making takes into account the interdependence of economic, environmental and social well being;
- **A Healthy Environment**, where decision-making takes into account long term consequences of development on natural and built up areas, and efforts are made to prevent problems before they occur;
- **Social Equity**, which is the promotion of fair and equal treatment across generations and among different groups in society, as well as the reduction in disparities in risks and access to benefits. Evidence of social equity includes housing and employment opportunities for all residents, regardless of age, education, cultural background or income, as well as inclusive and participatory decision-making processes. Social equity also means that the benefits derived from growth do not shift burdens to existing residents; and
- **Efficiency**, which includes the efficient use of energy and resources with little or no waste. This includes the efficient use of natural and fiscal resources (e.g., taxes and fees).¹

Objective: Within two years of adoption of the Blueprint, local governments will update their comprehensive plans to be consistent with the Blueprint, and within three years of adoption of the

¹ Text modified from *Exploring Sustainable Communities*, a teachers guide by World Resources Institute for secondary education.

Blueprint, local governments will update their land development regulations to be consistent with the policies established in Blueprint.

General Growth Management Policies

- GM-1: Map 1** establishes the growth tiers covering Ada County. To implement this plan in a consistent and coordinated manner, local governments shall use the growth tier map in conjunction with the applicable policies established in this section of the Blueprint to guide growth management decisions, including capital improvements planning, comprehensive plan amendments, annexations, area of impact extensions and development decisions.
- GM-2:** Ensure that development decisions are coordinated with the availability of essential public facilities so that adequate public facilities will be provided before or concurrent with the generation of demands for those facilities. [*Comment: this will require ongoing coordination between local governments and independent public service providers.*]
- GM-3:** Coordinate land use and capital facility planning by requiring capital improvement programs by service providers to be consistent with adopted comprehensive plans and the Blueprint for Good Growth.
- GM-4:** Establish and use the Blueprint revision process to ensure that local growth management decisions are consistent with the County-wide growth management strategy established in the Blueprint. [*Comment: see the implementation section for a description of the Blueprint revision process.*]
- GM-5:** Develop and update local transportation elements of the comprehensive plans in conjunction with ACHD, Valley Regional Transit, *ITD* and *COMPASS* to ensure that policies reflect the ability to provide and maintain adequate transportation system capacity. Local plans and development decisions shall be consistent with the ACHD Capital Improvements Program, the Long-Range Transportation Plan, and the Valley Regional Transit Regional Operations and Capital Improvement Plan, as amended from time to time.
- GM-6:** Coordinate development decisions with local and regional plans for the full range of public facilities, as well as open space and environmental protection.
- GM-7:** Encourage cities and the county, as applicable, to establish long-term annexation agreements pursuant to policy GM-18 to minimize intergovernmental conflicts and provide greater predictability for property owners.
- GM-8:** Evaluate development proposals and future land use map amendments, are consistent with the Long Range Transportation Plan and the 20-year ACHD Capital Improvements Plan. For new development:
1. Require the submittal of a concept plan for all contiguous land holdings prior to the first preliminary plat approval.
 2. Ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the applicable comprehensive plan, the Blueprint tier map, and the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the ACHD 20-Year CIP.
 3. Establish the base residential and non-residential intensity at the time of concept plan approval, considering:
 - a. the adequacy of essential public facilities;
 - b. applicable comprehensive plan policies;
 - c. the proximity of the project to existing employment centers;
 - d. consistency of the project with the Long Range Transportation Plan and the ACHD 20-Year CIP; and
 - e. physical limitations of the site.

Activity Center Policies

GM-9: Identify activity centers within individual comprehensive plans that are consistent with the Blueprint Tier map and assign appropriate land use categories and densities within each activity center to promote a sustainable mix of land uses that reduces automobile dependency and supports pedestrian trips.

GM-10: Establish standards for community and regional activity centers that require minimum densities of residential areas of at least 8 dwelling units per acre, where feasible, minimum levels of pedestrian connectivity and transit facilities that are sufficient to support viable transit service. The following intensities are provided to guide local jurisdictions in defining centers:

Activity Center Type	Typical Residential Unit Types	Density Ranges (1)	Non-Residential Project Size
Regional	Two plus story townhomes, apartments, condominiums	Greater than 20 dwellings per acre	Greater than 150,000 sq.ft. of gross leasable area
Community	Mixed density projects, Townhomes, low-rise apartments, condominiums	12 to 20 dwellings per acre	25,000 to 150,000 sq.ft. of gross leasable area
Neighborhood	Low intensity townhomes, other attached single family units, garden apartments, patio homes	8 to 16 dwellings per acre	Less than 25,000 sq.ft. of gross leasable area

(1) Open space, civic uses, on site amenities and other factors may reduce gross densities. See model TOD standards for examples

GM-11: Establish mixed-use development standards that allow appropriate scales of mixed use development by right within each type of activity center.

Areas of Impact Policies

GM-12: Establish and adjust Area of Impact boundaries based upon:

1. coordinated 20-year capital facility plans that reflect historical or reasonably anticipated funding levels to facilitate the efficient provision of adequate water, wastewater, stormwater and transportation facilities;
2. recent growth trends and projected growth of the applicable city;
3. the availability of adequate land supplies within the city and its area of impact to meet the amount and diversity of growth that may be reasonably anticipated by the city [*Comment: the evaluation of land supplies should consider the availability of a mix of infill and green-field development opportunities required to meet projected growth demands.*];
4. the existence of short-term (e.g., 5-year) capital improvements programs that are adequately funded to accommodate growth anticipated within at least 20 percent of the area of impact; and
5. inter-governmental agreements with the County and applicable service providers to coordinate land use and infrastructure decisions in accordance with the policies established in this plan.

GM-13: Within Areas of Impact, identify areas where essential public facilities are available and areas where essential public facilities are scheduled to be available based on 5-year CIP to coordinate development patterns with efficient infrastructure system development.

GM-14: Where essential public facilities are available, the County may approve development applications that are consistent with local plans, regulations and adopted facility extension/connection policies.

GM-15: Where essential public facilities are scheduled to be available in accordance with and adopted 5-Year CIP, the County may approve development that is consistent with local plans, regulations and facility connection policies, subject to the extension of public facilities and the applicable service providers' reimbursement policies for capacity that exceeds demands generated by the development.

GM-16: Where essential public facilities are not scheduled to be provided within adopted 5-Year an CIP, the applicable city and Ada County may take one of the following actions after considering the factors listed below:

Actions¹

- Approval of the entire development application subject to execution of a development agreement that provides for adequate public facilities for the entire development and compliance with mutually agreed upon plans, regulations and infrastructure policies; or
- approval of development of up to 20 percent of the land area² in the development, subject to execution of a development agreement assuring that:
 - the initial portion to be developed will be consistent with the applicable city's comprehensive plan, development regulations and infrastructure policies, and
 - the concept plan for all contiguous land holdings is consistent with the applicable city's comprehensive plan, development regulations and infrastructure policies, and
 - the applicant commits to future annexation and full funding of facilities, including funding for future connection of the portion of the site that is initially developed to centralized water and wastewater systems; or
- Disapproval of the development application.

Factors

- Consistency of the concept plan for the portion to be developed and the entire property with the applicable city's comprehensive plan;
- System-wide benefits provided by proposed public facilities;
- Local and regional fiscal and economic benefits;
- Capital obligations generated by the development;
- Operations and maintenance obligations generated by the development; and
- Other benefits consistent with the city's adopted comprehensive plan goals (e.g., housing, environmental, recreational, economic, transportation, etc).

GM-17: When an applicant seeks an exception to adopted public improvement standards within an area of impact, the exception shall require approval by both the applicable city

¹ Through any development approval, the City and County may require the reservation of sufficient right-of-way and easements to serve planned development in the vicinity of the project. Dry sewers may be required if elevations can be determined at the time of development.

² The remaining 80 percent may be developed when the City determines that the full range of facilities and services are adequate to serve the entire site.

and Ada County to avoid future infrastructure deficiencies that impede future growth and service delivery.

I.

GM-18: Adjustments to area of impact boundaries to reflect 20-year growth plans shall include an agreement not to annex beyond the area of impact unless approved by the county or the other affected city if the area lies within the other city's area of impact. Pursuant to Policy GM-7, local governments are encouraged to enter into annexation boundary agreements that establish ultimate boundary lines between individual cities and are based upon the following factors:

- Anticipated growth and the need for additional land to serve the cities' residential and non-residential land use needs;
- Sewer service basins and the capacity to serve development in those basins;
- Other service area boundaries (e.g., school districts, fire districts)
- Geographic features (e.g., ridges, waterways, arterial streets, railroads, greenways) that form appropriate breaks between communities; and
- Public input from affected property owners.

City Policies

GM-19: Ensure that development decisions are consistent with the adopted comprehensive plans, regulations, the Long Range Transportation Plan, the ACHD 20-year CIP and the Valley Regional Transit plans.

GM-20: Establish a mix of uses that maintains or improves the balance of jobs, housing and services in each city to improve local fiscal health and reduce long-term transportation demands.

GM-21: Base annexation decisions on the availability of essential public facilities, the schedule for provision of those facilities in applicable capital improvements plans, area of impact boundaries, fiscal benefits, economic benefits, the need for additional development areas, and the local comprehensive plan.

Rural Tier Policies

GM-22: Limit development in the rural tier to an average of three percent (3%) of projected county-wide population growth within any three-year period, exclusive of development approved within a planned community. This limitation should be based on new lot creation and, if the County approves preliminary plats including enough new lots in the rural tier to equal three percent (3%) of all lots approved in preliminary plats throughout all tiers in the County within any three year period, subdivision action shall be deferred until the following year in accordance with adopted County standards.

GM-23: Establish an equity-based program to secure permanent open space within the rural tier through the use of techniques such as: conservation subdivisions, transfers of development rights, or purchases of land, conservation easements or development rights.

Planned Communities Policies

GM-24: Subject to the policies of this section, comprehensive plan consistency and compliance with applicable development regulations, encourage planned communities to be established within cities and areas of impact and allow for planned communities in rural areas of the County. If the total number of lots platted within the rural tier plus the lots platted in all planned communities located outside of an area of impact exceeds seven percent (7%) of the total lots receiving final plat approval throughout the county for any and given year, then the Blueprint Consortium will evaluate plan policies and regulations to assess the need for modifications to encourage more infill development.

GM-25: For planned communities located within an area of impact, abutting an area of impact or located within the distance from city's corporate boundaries established in Idaho Statutes §50-101, require an annexation agreement as a condition of project approval.

GM-26: Adjust development standards to encourage planned communities or developments providing the benefits of planned communities within cities and their areas of impact. These standards, described more fully in the implementation section of this plan, may include, minimum density thresholds, by-right development patterns that allow a mix of uses and dwelling types subject to administrative review, trip-generation credits for mixed use and transit-oriented development patterns and other incentives to create more sustainable development patterns.

GM-27: For all planned communities:

1. Require the submittal of a concept plan for all contiguous land holdings to be included within the planned community. Prior to approving any extensions to a concept plan require the cumulative analysis of facility, service and fiscal impacts for all lands to be included within the planned community, including the creation of facility and service demands in portions of the development located outside of Ada County.
2. Prior to approval of a planned community, ensure that the development is consistent with the County's comprehensive plan, the Blueprint tier map, the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the ACHD 20-Year CIP.
3. Assign the base residential and non-residential intensity at the time of concept plan approval, considering:
 - a. the adequacy of essential public facilities;
 - b. consistency of the project with the Long Range Transportation Plan, the ACHD 20-Year CIP and the Valley Regional Transit Plan;
 - c. the proximity of the project to existing employment centers; and
 - d. physical limitations of the site.
4. The location and/or mix of uses should result in a significant reduction in travel demand in comparison to conventional development..³

GM-28: Refine existing County development regulations addressing planned communities outside areas of impact to implement policy GM-28 and the following policies:

1. Ensure that planned communities fund 100 percent of on and off-site capital improvement costs for essential public facilities and emergency service facilities required to serve the proposed development.
2. Ensure that development will fully fund operations and maintenance costs for water, wastewater, transportation, public safety and emergency services at adopted levels of service. (see Strategies section for discussion of alternative funding tools)

GM-29: Ensure that planned community regulations establish a mix of uses and housing types that:

- Serve diverse income and age groups;

³ Note that trip reduction targets may be achieved for residential planned communities if they are located within a mile of a designated community or regional activity center or a major employment center. Travel demand reduction should consider trip generation and vehicle miles traveled.

- Integrate parks and open space areas that are consistent with local plans and regulations and provide an incentive to preserve high value natural resources;⁴ and
- Distinguish standards for open space and land use mix based on the type of planned community and its location.

Public Lands Policy

GM-30: Coordinate with state, federal and local agencies to:

1. develop and maintain an inventory of public lands for use by all service providers in identifying opportunities for collocation of compatible public uses;
2. identify potential land swaps that result in more efficient protection of resources within Ada County;
3. maintain or enhance access to public lands for public access and emergency service provision;
4. maintain or enhance connectivity between public lands for recreational or wildlife purposes;
5. review the impacts of proposed development of lands on
 - a. the preceding policies;
 - b. land use compatibility; and
 - c. transportation system function.

Transit Corridor Policies

Note: *While the emphasis of this section is on the preservation of transit corridors that are anticipated to provide some level of service within the next 20 years, this plan anticipates that long term need for more extensive transit services to efficiently move people throughout Ada County and other portions of the Treasure Valley. The preservation of future transit opportunities is critical to ensure that needed services needed beyond the planning period can be established to serve future residents.*

GM-31: **Map 2** shows the key arterial routes that have the greatest potential as primary bus transit corridors. Local governments should require development within these bus transit corridors to safely and efficiently accommodate necessary transit facilities as identified by Valley Regional Transit. These facilities may include on-street bus stops with convenient pedestrian and bicycle access, pullout lanes at community activity centers or on-site transit stations at regional activity centers, and shall comply with Valley Regional Transit design standards.

GM-32: To support the provision of efficient and convenient transit service, cities should encourage or require minimum gross densities of at least 8 dwelling units per acre near activity centers and potential transit stops within identified bus transit corridors. Where stable neighborhoods or natural resources inhibit the compatible establishment of higher densities, seek to obtain transit supportive densities and designs in mixed use activity centers in other areas along the corridors.

GM-33: **Map 2** illustrates the corridors most likely to support high capacity transit services (e.g., bus rapid transit, light rail or commuter rail). Light or commuter rail is planned for the existing rail corridor. Bus rapid transit (BRT) service has been studied and is proposed for the State Street corridor. Chinden Boulevard could provide another opportunity for BRT if the right-of-way and abutting development support the service. To enable the provision of high capacity transit services, local governments should require minimum densities of at least 16 dwelling units per acre within one-quarter mile of potential transit stops. Potential stops are illustrated on **Map 2**, for the light rail and State

⁴ Regulations may provide for the mitigation of a portion of open space requirements through off-site land preservation.

Street corridors. The identification of potential sites along the Chinden corridor will require more study.

GM-34: Adopt and apply transit-oriented development design standards that address connectivity, pedestrian access, parking and transit facility design within all bus transit corridors and within one-half mile of all high capacity transit facilities. *[Comment: TOD design standards to be included in implementation section appendix]*

GM-35: Ensure that local development decisions are consistent with adopted transportation and transit plans to promote effective movement of people and goods.

C. Transportation Goal, Objectives and Policies

This section establishes policies to coordinate transportation facilities with future development. In addition to establishing policies for road corridor preservation, it addresses transit corridor preservation and the incorporation of non-motorized (e.g., bike/pedestrian) transportation facilities and services into the overall transportation system. Other key transportation policies address connectivity, streetscape, traffic calming techniques, interconnectivity and other issues identified in this Plan.

[Comment: Many of the following policies are contingent upon the adoption of different level of service (LOS) standards for different areas/road segments (e.g., lower congestion thresholds in rural areas, such as LOS B or C and the identification of constrained facilities in high priority areas such as downtowns and activity centers that may continue to operate at LOS E without impeding future development).]

Transportation Goal: To coordinate land use and transportation decisions to efficiently meet the full range of mobility needs.⁵

Objectives:

- Establish a formal plan amendment review process to ensure that local comprehensive plans, the Long Range Transportation Plan, the ACHD 20-year CIP, ITD Improvement Plans and the Valley Regional Transit Regional Operations and Capital Improvement Plan are consistent to ensure that planned land uses and transportation facilities are mutually supportive.⁶
- Within four years of adoption of the Blueprint for Good Growth, implement a transportation management program that is consistent with the following transportation policies.

Transportation Policies

T-1: Establish appropriate level of service standards that:

- Allow greater levels of congestion in cities and activity centers than in outlying areas;
- Recognize the capacity constraints of some key corridors by allowing for greater levels of congestion in constrained corridors;
- Allow for greater levels of congestion along identified transit corridors.

T-2: Establish context sensitive street cross-sections that safely convey existing and projected traffic in accordance with established level of service standards, while addressing the following factors:

1. Compatibility with planned land uses along the corridor, which may include setbacks needed to buffer existing or planned development from noise and odors generated within the transportation corridor;
2. Safe access to abutting properties (note: this may be provided through parallel roads, alleys or private drives along arterial streets);
3. Bicycle and pedestrian traffic;
4. Access to and compatibility with transit services; and
5. Stormwater and flood management needs.

⁵ Mobility in this goal refers to the ability to move goods and people throughout Ada County.

⁶ ACHD will continue to plan for street capacity to serve development approved by local governments in accordance with adopted plans. While near term projects shown in the 20-year CIP reflect past development approvals that more closely reflect “trend” development patterns, longer term projects should reflect planned land uses that are consistent with “Community Choices”, the preferred growth scenario adopted through the Long Range Transportation Plan update process and locally adopted land use plans. Because ACHD’s CIP will be based on local plans, future development decisions that are inconsistent with adopted plans may result in transportation service deficiencies.

T-3: **Map 3** is the functional classification map that indicates the planned function of future roadways. This map shall be used in conjunction with cross-sections developed pursuant with policy T-2 to identify right-of-way needs and to prevent encroachment of development into rights-of-way needed to serve existing and planned development. Local governments, ACHD, IDT and Valley Regional Transit shall coordinate to ensure that adequate right-of-way is protected and secured.

T-4: Local governments will coordinate to preserve needed right-of-way.

- a. Along corridors where additional right-of-way is needed, require development to provide its pro-rata share of the right-of-way and improvements.
- b. If additional right-of-way is needed and it is not conveyed to ACHD, ITD or other entity prior to development, buildings and required parking shall be located outside of the planned right-of-way. The maximum development intensity of the project shall be based on the land area of the site prior to acquisition of the additional right-of-way, so the property owner can maintain the site's development value even after the additional right-of-way is conveyed.

T-5: Establish minimum connectivity requirements to improve traffic flow, pedestrian connectivity, bicycle access, transit access and minimize projected vehicle miles traveled from new development. Require new development along arterial streets to provide access parallel to the arterial street via an appropriate combination of frontage roads, private drives and parallel collector streets.

T-6: Establish and maintain a more detailed transportation model that will track existing, committed (e.g., approved), and planned traffic demands, as well as their impacts on arterial and collector intersections. Continually refine the model to provide more effective guidance in the review of traffic mitigation proposals.

T-7: Adopt and implement the ACHD Pedestrian-Bicycle Transportation Plan to establish routes that make walking and bicycles a viable transportation alternative for some individuals. The Plan shall address the need to establish bicycle and pedestrian access to identified transit routes.

T-8: In conjunction with the development of context-sensitive street cross-sections, develop and adopt a menu of traffic calming provisions in the design manual that:

1. Effectively slow traffic to;
2. Allow streets to function at planned capacities; and
3. Do not obstruct emergency access to and through neighborhoods.

T-9: To facilitate transit services that provide effective alternatives to automotive travel, ensure that development and street designs are consistent with the Transit Corridor development policies established in GM-31 through GM-35.

T-10: Refine street system capital funding sources so that adequate funds are available for capacity expansion in addition to the maintenance and operations of existing facilities. Evaluate the full range of strategies to enhance capital funding, including, but not limited to:

1. Ongoing adjustment of local street impact fees to ensure that they keep up with rising construction and right-of-way costs;
2. Expansion of impact fees to include state routes and the collector street system;
3. The use of special districts to fund extraordinary capital and operations/maintenance costs associated with developments of regional impact;
4. Vehicle registration fees and other user charges;
5. Dedication and improvement requirements for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

D. Utilities Goal, Objectives and Policies

Coordination of utilities with growth and development decisions is an objective that will be difficult to achieve due to the large number of service providers. Utilities are provided within Ada County through a collection of municipal, public and private service providers. Electrical service is provided by Idaho Power. Water and sewer service is provided by municipal and other public and private service providers. Stormwater management responsibilities are shared between local governments, irrigation entities, ACHD and various flood control agencies. Despite the challenges created by the fragmented service provision, this plan strongly supports continued efforts to share information and coordinate capital and service provision plans.

Utility Goals:

1. To compatibly and safely integrate necessary utility facilities with future growth and development;
2. To ensure that utility systems are adequate to meet the needs of residents and businesses;
3. To minimize energy consumption and water demands through aggressive conservation measures (e.g., green buildings, xeriscaping, grey-water usage); and
4. To minimize the negative impacts of utility provision on the natural and built environments.

Utility Objectives:

1. Within two years of adoption of the Blueprint, local governments will update local plans to identify public utility needs and to make accommodations for the facilities required to deliver projected services.
2. Within three years of adoption of the Blueprint, local governments will update their land development regulations to be consistent with the policies established in this section.

Utility Policies

U-1: Adopt and enforce minimum fire flow requirements or alternative fire suppression options for all development located within cities and all development within areas of impact that is served by centralized water and sewer service.

U-2: Plan for the extension of municipally approved sewer service throughout cities and their areas of impact, except in areas specifically planned for large lot residential development. Ensure that development in planned sewer service areas is designed to be connected to the municipal sewer system. Where development of interim facilities is authorized pursuant to policy GM-16, ensure that provisions are made for the future connection of the development to the applicable municipal system.

U-3: Map 4 illustrates the general locations of electrical system substations required to serve planned development within each community. Local governments shall coordinate with Idaho Power to ensure that adequate land is planned for siting these facilities and associated power lines.

U-4: Annually review of applicable short and long-range utility capital plans with all utility providers⁷ to discuss projected short and long-term demands from development, facility siting and construction needs, and right-of-way and easement acquisition needs.

U-5: Coordinate development reviews with applicable service providers to ensure that new development can be served safely and adequately.

U-6: Evaluate alternatives to coordinate and provide a stable funding source for coordinated stormwater and flood management services that address the needs of ACHD, irrigation entities, flood control districts and local municipalities, including compliance with NPDES stormwater quality requirements. Alternatives may include the expansion of an existing agency's mandate or the creation of a new stormwater management utility.

⁷ This should include all water, wastewater, electric, telecommunications and natural gas service providers.

U-7: Promote energy conservation, protecting solar access and support the use of clean, renewable alternative energy production technologies.

E. Public Schools Goal, Objective and Policies

Three school districts provide public school facilities and services in Ada County. Each of these districts faces unique growth related challenges, the outcome of which will have a dramatic impact on the quality of life in Ada County. The most significant challenge faced by local school districts is the funding of the capital facilities needed to serve anticipated growth.

Public School Goal: To coordinate development decisions with the capacity of local school districts to provide high quality educational facilities and services.

Public School Objective: To establish adequate public school facility requirements within two years after the adoption of the Blueprint for Good Growth.

Public School Policies

PS-1: Coordinate with local school districts to secure sufficient funding to meet anticipated demands from the state or other local sources.

PS-2: Coordinate with local school districts to:

- identify land acquisition needs for public schools and facilitate dedication and or acquisition of needed sites; and
- ensure that public school facilities are adequate to meet projected demands from new development.

PS-3: Coordinate with school districts to establish appropriate school siting criteria that address:

- Appropriate access for elementary, middle and high schools;
- Opportunities for collocation of recreation and other appropriate facilities; and
- The extension and funding of support infrastructure, including, but not limited to water, sewer and streets.

BLUEPRINT FOR GOOD GROWTH
STEERING COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE ROSTER rev 6/5/06 Page 1

NAME	AGENCY	JOINT 12/9/04	12/15/04	JOINT 1/18/05	2/15/05	3/1/05	3/15/05	4/7/05	5/16/05	6/21/05	7/28/05	8/24/05	9/28/05	10/27/05	11/16/05	12/8/05	1/5/06	1/26/06	2/16/06	3/9/06	4/20/06	5/5/06	5/24/06
Katey Levihn	ACHD			X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X
Bruce Mills	ACHD	X		X			X		X	X		X											
Steve Price	ACHD				X														X	X			
J Schweitzer	ACHD			X	X		X																
Craig Quintana (alt.)	ACHD			X																			
Sabrina Bowman (alt.)	ACHD																		X		X		
Don Kostelec (alt.)	ACHD																			X		X	
Gerry Armstrong	Ada County	X		X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Pete Friedman	Ada County	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Byron Cochrane (alt.)	Ada County			X																			
Richard Cook (alt.)	Ada County						X																
Dean Gunderson (alt.)	Ada County	X	X	X	X	X	X		X														
Carla Olson (alt.)	Ada County	X																					
Michael Wilson (alt.)	Ada County			X								X											
Johanna Young (alt.)	Ada County																				X		
Roger Sherman	Affordable Housing																						
Paul Calverly	Agriculture		X																X				
Ruby German	Agriculture			X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Dawayne Yamamoto	Agriculture	X	X																				
Bill Clayton	Boise River Flood Control	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jack McLeod (alt.)	Boise River Flood Control	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X		X		X	
Steve Sweet (alt.)	Boise River Flood Control	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Kathleen Lacey	City of Boise	X		X		X	X	X	X					X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Karen Gallagher (alt.)	City of Boise											X											
Lance Evans (alt.)	City of Boise															X		X					
Charles Trainor	COMPASS	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	
Patricia Nilsson (alt.)	COMPASS								X														
Toni Tisdale (alt.)	COMPASS	X	X	X					X														
Terri Schorzman (alt.)	COMPASS	X		X																			
Nicole Prehoda (alt.)	COMPASS	X																					
Debbie Winchar (alt.)	COMPASS			X																			
Michael Gifford	Contracting Community																						
Tracy Vance	Chambers (Meridian)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X		X										
Ray Stark	Chambers (Boise Metro)				X			X								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
James Grunke (alt.)	Chambers (Boise Metro)								X														
Bill Clark	Development (Res.)	X		X	X		X		X	X		X	X		X		X					X	X
David Turnbull	Development (Com.)		X		X		X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X
N. Baird-Spencer	City of Eagle				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Peter O'Neill	Economic Development	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Clay Carley	Economic Development	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Andy Brunelle	Environmental		X		X			X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Greg Abramson							X			X	X				X	X	X						
John Evans	Garden City		X		X		X	X	X			X		X	X								
Berrin Nejad	Garden City				X																		
Diane Kushlan	Garden City																	X	X				
Christy Richardson	Garden City																					X	
Deanna Smith	ID Smart Growth	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

**BLUEPRINT FOR GOOD GROWTH
STEERING COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE ROSTER rev 6/5/06 Page 2**

NAME	AGENCY	JOINT 12/9/04	12/15/04	JOINT 1/18/05	2/15/05	3/1/05	3/15/05	4/7/05	5/16/05	6/21/05	7/28/05	8/24/05	9/28/05	10/27/05	11/16/05	12/8/05	1/5/06	1/26/06	2/16/06	3/9/06	4/20/06	5/5/06	5/24/06
Charles Rountree	ITD	X			X		X	X		X		X											
Eric Shannon	ITD				X		X			X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Sue Sullivan (alt.)	ITD	X	X	X	X	X			X					X	X								
Bryant Keuchle (alt.)	ITD	X																					
Diana Sanders	City of Kuna	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X	X		X					
Lisa Bachman (alt.)	City of Kuna																		X				
Melodie Halstead (alt.)	City of Kuna		X																				
Anna Canning	City of Meridian							X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Brad Hawkins-Clark	City of Meridian	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X											
Steve Siddoway (alt.)	City of Meridian	X		X																			
Dick Armstrong	Large Employers								X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		
Mike Reynoldson	Large Employers		X						X														
Gary Allen	Neighborhoods	X	X	X	X		X		X			X	X	X		X	X		X	X			X
Linda Clark	Public Schools	X										X											
Wendel Bigham (alt.)	Public Schools			X					X							X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Eric Exline (alt.)	Public Schools			X													X						
Mayor Nathan Mitchell	City of Star				X								X										
Sherry McKibben	U of I		X	X					X	X						X	X	X	X				X
Ryan Armbruster	Urban Redevelopment			X	X				X														
Kelli Fairless	Valley Regional Transit	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Stephen Hunt (alt.)	Valley Regional Transit	X		X																			

CONSULTANTS

Dr. R. Freilich	Paul Hastings		X		X								X										
Michael Lauer	Planning Works		X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Karen Doherty	Doherty & Associates	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Zach Piepmeyer	Doherty & Associates											X		X	X								
Heather Carroll	Doherty & Associates			X																			

**BLUEPRINT FOR GOOD GROWTH
STEERING COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE ROSTER rev 6/5/06 Page 3**

OTHER ATTENDEES

NAME	AGENCY	JOINT 12/9/04	12/15/04	JOINT 1/18/05	2/15/05	3/1/05	3/15/05	4/7/05	5/16/05	6/21/05	7/28/05	8/24/05	9/28/05	10/27/05	11/16/05	12/8/05	1/5/06	1/26/06	2/16/06	3/9/06	4/20/06	5/5/06	5/24/06
David Ausherman	Fregonese Calthorpe	X		X																			
Sonja Hennem	Kittleson & Assoc	X		X																			
Russ Dane	Ada Cty Assoc Realtors		X	X	X	X	X	X															
Kathie Brady	Boise County			X																			
Susan Mason	BSU			X																			
Brant Jewett	Canyon County	X																					
Scott Ellsworth	CH2M Hill	X																					
Vern Brewer	Holladay Engin Co	X																					
Kent McCarthy	Idaho Power						X											X					
Cynthia Sewell	Idaho Statesman								X														
Joe Haynes	LHTAC	X																					
Diane Kushlam	Observer								X									X					
Jennifer Oxley	RBCI			X																			
Rosemary Curtin	RBCI	X																					
Jane Suggs	JBS Enterprises, LLC											X	X		X								
Julie Lynn	Nouvelle Group											X											
Ryan Cantlon	Colliers											X											
Ashley Ford	WRG Design, Inc											X											
Brian DeHaas	WRG Design, Inc											X											
Diane Kushlan	Garden City												X	X									
Kathleen Moriehacer	City of Boise												X										
Bob Taunton	Suncor													X	X	X	X					X	
Candy Miller	DE Miller														X								
Mike Wardle	Suncor																X	X	X	X			X
Martin Johncox	Skyline																			X		X	X

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium
FROM: Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator
DATE: June 5, 2006
RE: **Local Project Coordinator Report**

Action Requested:

Attached billing information is for your information only. No action is requested at this time.

**Blueprint for Good Growth, Inc.
Project Billing Summary
by Doherty & Associates, Inc.
for Project Coordination Services**

Invoice Summary as of 5/31/2006

**Actual Consultant Hours Spent to
Date as of 5/26/2006**

<i>Invoice #</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Hours</i>	<i>Total</i>
1240	12/31/2004	\$ 7,058.82	Doherty	910.00	\$ 95,550.00
1249	1/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Carroll	63.50	\$ 5,334.00
1254	3/9/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Malloy	196.00	\$ 5,504.68
1270	4/1/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Piepmeyer	48.90	\$ 3,423.00
1276	5/2/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Nemec	57.00	\$ 3,819.00
1297	5/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Brosious	3.00	\$ 84.27
1312	6/30/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Hackett	33.00	\$ 2,178.00
1319	7/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Total	1311.40	\$ 115,892.95
1331	8/30/2005	\$ 3,529.41			
1340	10/3/2005	\$ 3,529.41			
1350	10/31/2005	\$ 4,716.91			
1360	11/28/2005	\$ 4,716.91			
1372	12/30/2005	\$ 4,716.91			
1383	1/30/2006	\$ 4,716.91			
1391	2/27/2006	\$ 4,716.91			
1399	4/3/2006	\$ 4,716.91			
1408	5/1/2006	\$ 1,187.50			
1422	5/31/2006	\$ 1,187.53			
Total Invoiced to date		\$ 69,500.00			
Total Initial Budget Through May 31, 2006		\$ 69,500.00			
Extra Services Through May 31, 2006		\$ 45,000.00			
Total Budget Through May 31, 2006		\$ 114,500.00			
Project Coordination June 1 - December 31, 2006		\$ 40,000.00			
Remaining Contract		\$ 40,000.00			

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium
FROM: Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator
DATE: June 4, 2006
RE: **Funding Committee Status**

Action Requested:

For information only. This information provides you with a background on the funding status.

Background:

Funding Solicitation Status

Mayor Bieter and Mayor Merrill are working to establish meetings with Idaho Power, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and Intermountain Gas. Mayor Bieter and Commissioner Franden will be meeting with United Water (Greg Wyatt).

Commissioner Peavey-Derr and Commissioner Franden are working to set up meeting with Simplot to continue solicitation of funding.

Non-Profit Status

Application for non-profit status is in review at the IRS; Holland and Hart is currently reviewing status with IRS. Requested expedited review, however expedited review is doubtful since we cannot show a grant which will be lost if we do not gain non-profit status.

Tax Filing Obligations

Blueprint for Good Growth, Inc. is required to file information to the IRS. A six month extension has been filed since the 501(c)(3) is pending to verify which forms should be filed; the reporting requirements vary depending on the outcome of the 501(c)(3). The extension is valid to November 15, 2006.

Next Funding Committee Meeting

The next Funding Committee meeting will be held immediately (400-430 pm) after the June 8 Consortium meeting.

Funding Status

Following is a summary of the total contributions to date.

Name	Total	Notes
Ada County	\$ 160,000	\$50k ea Phase I and II; \$60k for Doherty
ACHD	150,000	\$122k for Phase I; \$28k for Phase II.
City of Boise	100,000	\$50k ea Phase I and II
ITD	50,000	
City of Meridian	30,000	
US Environmental Protection Agency	22,500	
City of Eagle	20,000	
City of Kuna	20,000	
City of Star	20,000	
City of Garden City	10,000	
COMPASS Yr End Sweep	9,266	Doherty supplemental.
Boise River Flood Control District #10	7,500	
Hewlett Packard Boise Operations	5,000	Phase II
Tom Ryder	500	
North End Neighborhood Assn.	300	
Total Contributions	\$ 605,066	

Overall Financial Status	
Phase I Budget	\$ 405,000
Phase II Budget	350,000
Local Project Coordination Budget	154,500
Total Budget	\$ 909,500
Less Total Contributions	(605,066)
Total Deficit (Phase II)	\$ 304,434