



Consortium Member Agency Meeting
Thursday, August 3, 2006 1:30 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.
Meridian Police Department – First Floor Conference Room

AGENDA

I. Consent Agenda

- a. Approval of the June 8 Meeting Notes (pg. 2-5)
- b. Authorization of Payment for March-May 2006 Paul Hastings Invoices (pg. 6-9)

II. Project Status Update

- a. **Project Status Update from Michael Lauer and Timetable for Adoption of BGG Policies (pg. 10-19)**

Michael will provide feedback to the Consortium regarding the July focus group, Idaho Smart Growth, Chamber of Commerce, and Urban Land Institute meetings. The Consortium will discuss its timetable for adoption of the BGG policies.

III. Action

- a. **December Meeting Date**

Michael Lauer has been asked to give a presentation to Leadership Boise on December 14. He requests to reschedule the December Consortium meeting from December 7 to December 14, 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM to be held at the ACHD Auditorium.

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

IV. Information

- a. **Project Coordinator's Report (pg. 20-21)**
- b. **Funding Status (pg. 22-25)**

BGG Funding Committee meeting immediately following Consortium meeting.

Remaining 2006 Consortium meetings are as follows:
September 7, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, ACHD Auditorium
October 5, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, ACHD Auditorium
November 2, 2006, 130 - 330 PM, ACHD Auditorium
December 2006, (SEE ITEM II b)

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, June 8, 2006 2:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M.**

Attendees:

David Bieter, Mayor, City of Boise *
Elaine Clegg, Council member, City of Boise
Tammy de Weerd, Mayor, City of Meridian*
John Evans, Mayor, Garden City*
John Franden, President, ACHD *
Pete Friedman, Ada County *
Nancy Merrill, Mayor, City of Eagle *
Charles Rountree, Administrator, Division of Planning, ITD
Jim Tibbs, Council member, City of Boise

Others:

Karen Doherty, Doherty & Associates
Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
Michael Lauer, Planning Works
Kent McCarthy, Idaho Power
Deanna Smith, Idaho Smart Growth
Charles Trainor, COMPASS
Bob Taunton, SunCor
Ruby German, Agriculture
Cynthia Sewell, Idaho Statesman

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 May 4 Meeting Notes**
Consent agenda approved.

ACTION ITEMS

a. Steering Committee Status and Recommendations

Michael Lauer briefed the Consortium on the Steering Committee actions. The Steering Committee unanimously recommended adoption and implementation of the goals, objectives, and policies as noted in the Consortium meeting packet with following exceptions:

GM-22: Limit development in the rural tier to an average of three percent (3%) of projected countywide 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.

Councilmember Clegg asked if there was a rural style of planned community with more open space conservation and less business emphasis. Lauer responded that "the idea" of different types of Planned Communities is captured in the draft plan. This was observed by Ada County in their scanning tours and the ground work for differing types of Planned Communities is already laid in the Draft Plan.

Lauer noted in 2005 that 5% of the rural tier plats (outside the Areas of Impact) utilized 45% of the 2005 newly platted acreage.

The next item discussed was GM-24 as follows.

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.

Lauer noted the Steering Committee has done an extraordinary job over the last 18 months for the Blueprint. He suggested recognition for the Steering Committee, the Consortium concurred.

Lauer requested direction on three items to move forward with the plan:

- o Conduct focus groups in mid-July;
- o Coordinate with the Chamber, Idaho Smart Growth, and Urban Land Institute to conduct joint meetings to receive feedback; and
- o Meet with the individual city representatives on the Technical Committee to discuss implementation.

Commissioner Franden suggested that we invite the other community chambers, including Meridian, to the joint meeting. Lauer will make this coordination.

Mayor Merrill indicated she preferred a single meeting with all of the focus group participants rather than individual meetings. Mayor de Weerd suggested a meeting with distinct formats utilizing a combination of small format and large group discussions. Members of the Steering and Technical committees could be utilized as facilitators. The Consortium directed Lauer to move forward with the focus groups in a combined meeting format to be held in mid-July.

Consortium agreed to have Lauer continue with Technical Committee coordination regarding implementation.

The members continued to discuss importance of Open Space in Phase II, definitions where planned communities would be allowed, concurrency plans, and Areas of Impact.

b. Cancellation of July 6 meeting

Members agreed to cancel the July 6 meeting. The next meeting will be August 3.

INFORMATION

c. Project Coordinator's Report

Karen Doherty provided an update regarding the project coordination activities.

d. Funding Status

Jurisdiction	Request	Responsible Funding Member	Status
Ada County	\$ 50,000	Peavey-Derr	Ongoing
Boise	\$ 50,000	Bieter	Approved by Boise
Meridian	\$ 30,000	Merrill	Ongoing
Eagle	\$ 20,000	Merrill	Approved by Eagle, contingent upon other agreement of all other donations as shown, a fully appropriated scope for the project as well as deliverables to the individual entities.
Kuna	\$ 20,000	Bieter	Ongoing
Star	\$ 20,000	Peavey-Derr	Ongoing
Garden City	\$ 20,000	Peavey-Derr	Ongoing
ACHD	\$ -		
ITD	\$ -		
Total	\$ 210,000		

The funding status report was given in lieu of a funding meeting. The funding committee has embarked this Spring on securing more funding from each jurisdiction. Boise City has recently pledged another \$50,000 and Eagle has pledged an additional \$20,000. Each of these pledges are included in the funding table above.

Including these two new pledges, the total remaining deficit is approximately \$234,000. If each jurisdiction pledges as outlined above, the outstanding deficit would then be approximately \$100,000 which the funding committee plans to raise from private sources.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 P.M.



MEMORANDUM:

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium
FROM: Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator
DATE: July 28, 2006
RE: Payment Approval

Action Requested:

Approve the payment of the outstanding invoices for Paul Hastings for Services as detailed below.

Background:

A billing summary for the services from Freilich/Lauer is attached. There are outstanding balances and approval for payment is requested based on percent work complete.

**Blueprint for Good Growth, Inc.
Project Billing Summary
Consulting Services**

Invoice Summary as of 5/31/06

<i>Vendor</i>	<i>Invoice</i>	<i>Service Date End</i>	<i>Invoice Amount</i>	<i>Aug 3 Recommend Pay</i>	<i>Unpaid Balance</i>	<i>Notes</i>
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	6	7/31/2004	\$80.00			
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	12	7/31/2004	\$507.00			
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	6	8/31/2004	\$26,091.10			
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	6	9/30/2004	\$27,475.19			
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	7	10/31/2004	\$25,014.58			
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	8	11/30/2004	\$19,369.50			
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	9	12/31/2004	\$17,853.15			
Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle	10	1/31/05; dated 2/17/05	\$31,646.58			
Paul Hastings	1432882	2/28/05; dated 4/7/05	\$24,570.00			
Paul Hastings	1428089	2/28/05; dated 5/16/05	\$15,828.97			
Paul Hastings	1436919	3/31/05; dated 5/16/05	\$45,581.40			
Paul Hastings	1443272	4/30/05; dated 5/20/05	\$13,604.53			
Paul Hastings	1447839	5/31/05; dated 6/15/05	\$22,879.58			
Paul Hastings	1457555	6/30/05; dated 7/25/05	\$6,646.42			
Paul Hastings	1464946	7/31/05; dated 8/26/05	\$21,189.39			
Paul Hastings	1468424	8/31/05; dated 9/20/05	\$1,435.88			
Paul Hastings	1474635	9/30/05; dated 10/14/05	\$18,511.46			
Paul Hastings	1482211	10/31/05; dated 11/16/05	\$25,941.80			
Paul Hastings	1489755	11/30/05; dated 12/19/05	\$1,981.70			
Paul Hastings	1496291	12/31/05; dated 1/18/06	\$30,738.04			
Paul Hastings	1501311	1/31/06; dated 2/28/06	\$8,292.67			
Paul Hastings	1505173	2/28/06; dated 3/20/06	\$2,682.98			
Paul Hastings	1514534	3/31/06; dated 4/24/06	\$9,653.86	\$9,653.86		(1)
Paul Hastings	1518707	4/30/06; dated 5/16/06	\$4,954.01	\$2,500.00	\$2,454.01	(1) and (2)
Paul Hastings	1521780	5/16/06; dated 5/25/06	\$6,624.80	\$0.00	\$6,624.80	(2)
Paul Hastings	1528092	5/31/06; dated 6/23/06	\$4,842.44	\$0.00	\$4,842.44	(2)
Total Recommended Approved as of 5/31/06			\$400,075.78	\$12,153.86	\$13,921.25	
Total Project Budget			\$ 755,000.00			
Remaining Contract			\$ 354,924.22			

Notes:

- (1) Approval for Recommended Payment will be sought by Consortium on August 3, 2006
- (2) Recommend withholding payment until percentage complete of work tasks is more than invoiced amount

BLUEPRINT FOR GOOD GROWTH BUDGET

KD review

		6/1/2006	
	Task Budget	Percent Complete	Amount Billable Total
Task 1: Consortium Workshop (July)			
	\$2,384		
Subtotal	\$2,384	100%	\$2,384
Task 2: Initial Review and Analysis			
2.1 Data Assembly.	\$5,960	100%	\$5,960
2.2 Physical Assessment.	\$17,868	100%	\$17,868
2.3 Planning Assessment.	\$19,868	100%	\$19,868
2.4 Regulatory Assessment.	\$19,868	100%	\$19,868
2.5 Growth Assessment.	\$9,934	100%	\$9,934
2.6 Community Issues Identification			
2.6.1 Focus Groups with Stakeholders	\$8,544	100%	\$8,544
2.6.2 Community Workshop (Oct)	\$9,240	100%	\$9,240
2.6.3 Consortium Workshop (Sept)	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
2.7 Needs, Issues and Opportunities Report.	\$19,868	100%	\$19,868
2.8 Consortium Workshop (Oct)	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
2.9 Interim Development Regulations.	\$4,769	100%	\$4,769
Subtotal	\$124,463		\$124,463
Task 3: Alternatives Map			
3.1 Steering Committee Workshop (Nov)	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
3.2 Community Workshops (Nov)	\$9,638	100%	\$9,638
3.3 Alternatives Mapping.	\$9,934	100%	\$9,934
3.4 Consortium Session (Nov)	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
Subtotal	\$28,116		\$28,116
Task 4: Refine Alternatives Map			
4.1 Steering Committee Workshop (Dec)	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
4.2 Technical Committee Work Session (Dec)	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
Subtotal	\$8,544		\$8,544
Task 5: Alternatives Impact Analysis			
5.1 Initial Analysis.	\$22,948	100%	\$22,948
5.2 Technical Committee Work Session.	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
5.3 Implementation Strategy Development.	\$7,948	100%	\$7,948
5.4 Steering Committee Workshop.	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
5.5 Alternatives Analysis Report.	\$40,730	80%	\$32,584
Subtotal	\$80,170		\$72,024
Task 6: Select Preferred Alternative			
6.1 Steering Committee Workshops.	\$9,638	100%	\$9,638
6.2 Community Workshops.	\$9,638	100%	\$9,638
6.3 Governing Entity Workshop.	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
Subtotal	\$23,548		\$23,548
Task 7: Preferred Alternative Implementation Strategy			
7.1 Draft Implementation Strategy.	\$17,868	90%	\$16,081
7.2 Steering Committee Workshop.	\$4,272	100%	\$4,272
Subtotal	\$22,140		\$20,353

Task 8: Initial Plan Draft				
	8.1 Draft Plan.	\$64,571	95%	\$61,342
	8.2 Steering Committee Workshop.	\$5,365	100%	\$5,365
Subtotal		\$69,936		\$66,707
Task 9: Stakeholder and Public Review				
	9.1 Community Workshops.	\$9,638	0%	\$0
	9.2 Focus Groups.	\$4,669	0%	\$0
	9.3 Decision-Maker Workshops.	\$4,272	0%	\$0
	9.4 Optional Survey.	\$0		
Subtotal		\$18,579		\$0
Task 10: Refine		\$24,141		
	10.1 Steering Committee Workshop.	\$4,272	50%	\$2,136
	10.2 Plan Refinement.	\$18,875	0%	\$0
Subtotal		\$23,147		\$2,136
Task 11: Plan Regulation Adoption				
	11.1 Plan Adoption.	\$3,973	0%	\$0
Subtotal		\$3,973		\$0
Subtotal				
TOTAL		\$405,000		\$348,276

Phase II (\$350,000)

Task 12: Initial Assessment				
	12.1 Physical and Market Assessment.	\$19,787	25%	\$4,947
	12.2 Regulatory Assessment.	\$19,787	70%	\$13,851
	12.3 Legal Assessment.	\$19,787	60%	\$11,872
	12.4 Market and Construction Assessment.	\$22,187	0%	\$0
	12.5 Infrastructure Assessment	\$22,187	30%	\$6,656
Task 13: Initial Draft Local Plan and Code Revisions.				
	13.1 Land Use/Growth Management Elements	\$39,574	15%	\$5,936
	13.2 Draft Initial Code Text.	\$59,361	15%	\$8,904
Task 14: Initial Review of Regulatory Documents				
	14.1 Planning Commission Summit	\$7,532	0%	\$0
	14.2 Planning Commission Briefing Report	\$15,830	0%	\$0
Task 15: Initial Revisions				
	15.1 Regulatory Revisions	\$29,680	0%	\$0
	15.2 Public Workshops	\$34,927	0%	\$0
	15.3 Planning Commission Briefing Report	\$29,680	0%	\$0
Task 16: Final Revisions				
	16.1 Final draft ordinances	\$29,680	\$0	\$0
Phase II Totals		\$350,000		\$52,166
Grand Totals		\$755,000		\$400,442

Memo



To: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium

From: Michael Lauer, AICP

Date: July 27, 2006

Re: BGG Status Report

Public Outreach.

In July, the BGG consulting team conducted a workshop with participants in the project's original focus groups and met with representatives from Idaho Smart Growth, the Chamber of Commerce and the Urban Land Institute. Summaries of these workshops are provided below. Written comments received after the workshops are attached to this memorandum.

Focus Group Questions and Comments: Focus group participants listened to a summary of the BGG recommendations and asked the following questions:

- What happens to the planned community proposals that are “in the works” relative to the Blueprint?

Response: This depends on where the applications are in the development process when codes are modified.

- Why do the commissioners hold up PC ordinance and say that they must approve applications that comply with the ordinance or they will be sued.

Response: The County must follow its ordinances. The intent of the existing planned community ordinance is clear, though there is a need to clarify some of the requirements. The County recently enacted a few clarifications, but BGG recommends additional clarifications.

- Are developers trying to sneak planned communities through the process before BGG is implemented? What is being done to protect road capacity?

Response: Certainly some landowners would like to have approvals before BGG is enacted, but the County currently has the authority to enact most of the BGG recommendations. ACHD and ITD are monitoring proposed developments and will seek additional capital funds as needed to meet demands through existing processes. Two important BGG recommendations will help address traffic demands. First, BGG recommends that COMPASS and ACHD address these cumulative traffic demands. Second, BGG requires all projects to be consistent with planned transportation system capacity.

- BGG uses numbers from CIM. Some of the CIM numbers don't take into account some of the new developments.

Response: Projections are a moving target. COMPASS is carefully monitoring development approvals and will adjust projections regularly in the future. Charles Trainor confirmed it is a dynamic process and they are doing more frequent updates.

- There were several questions about BGG's recommendations for Adequate Public Facilities.

Response: Consultant described how adequate public facilities requirements work and the importance of doing them correctly to avoid unintended consequences.

- Will BGG require joint land use approvals?

Response: Each jurisdiction will maintain its current jurisdiction and approval responsibilities. The Consortium has been clear that its members were not interested in surrendering their authority. While no joint approvals will be required, BGG will include intergovernmental agreements in which each entity agrees to act consistently with its plans and applicable transportation plans.

- When will the tiers map be updated?

Response: This is a critical early step to enact BGG policies. BGG consultants will be providing guidance on updating areas of impact over the next two months.

- What is Phase II?

Response: Over the next two months, the BGG consultant team will prepare

- model ordinances for transit oriented development, adequate public facilities and other issues addressed by plan policies;
- intergovernmental agreements to apply these BGG policies;
- comprehensive plan amendments to support BGG; and
- possibly some legislation.

- What happens to BGG if Prop 2 passes.

Response: Prop 2 could put a damper on implementation, but would force us to increase our focus on adequate public facility requirements.

ULI/ISG/Chamber Comments: In a meeting with representatives from these organizations, the following issues were raised:

- Leadership and consistency will be critical to the success of BGG;
- Open space is an important issue that shouldn't have been left out. However, because it has been left out, it should be a top priority for the next step;
- The business community needs some talking points to begin emphasizing the importance of this effort to the community and region;
- Areas of impact should be amended as soon as possible because so much of the plan depends on the establishment of reasonable boundaries;
- These organizations could assist with PR efforts; and
- Education of legislators will be essential to address local funding challenges. Failure to address local funding challenges will have negative effects statewide.

Next Steps

1. **Consortium Action:** No action by the Consortium is required at the August meeting. However, the Consortium should discuss its timetable for adoption of the BGG policies. One option would be to endorse the policies at the September meeting and to delay more formal action until drafts of critical phase 2 tasks have been completed. A second option would be to conduct additional community outreach in September, followed by action in October. This would provide the Consortium with the opportunity to gather more public input without having to delay action on Phase 2.

2. **Consultant Actions:** The Consultant team is in the process of drafting the following documents, which will be prepared in conjunction with Technical Committee representatives.
 - a. Comprehensive plan language incorporating key BGG growth coordination policies;
 - b. Guidelines for modification of area of impact boundaries;
 - c. Draft interlocal agreements addressing growth coordination policies within areas of impact;
 - d. Model transit oriented development standards to address design and intensity standards for neighborhood, community and regional activity standards;
 - e. Adequate public facility ordinance models, including detailed instructions for development and adoption of suitable level of service standards; and
 - f. Adjustments to ACHD's development manual.

July 26, 2006

Michael Lauer
Planning Works

RE: Blueprint for Good Growth Draft

Dear Michael:

The Land Trust of the Treasure Valley works to preserve important natural, scenic and recreation lands. We collaborate with landowners, citizens and agencies to protect stream corridors, habitat, wetlands and trail access that make our community unique.

My compliments to you, the steering committee and the consortium for your hard work and perseverance throughout the process. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft plan.

The primary topic for the Land Trust of the Treasure Valley is the minimal attention to open space conservation. As I understand, this topic was worked on and draft language created. We believe more attention should be paid to the importance that our natural open space provides to our quality of life. We suggest the following be included:

Open Space and Natural Resources

This plan supports the retention of open space for a wide variety of uses and the responsible use of natural resources that results in the protection of the environmental and aesthetic value of our land, air and water. While efforts to protect air quality will require regional solutions, local land use and transportation decisions could significantly reduce air pollutant generation from automobiles.

Open Space and Natural Resource Goal: To develop an interconnected system of open spaces and natural resource areas that:

- **Protect water quality;**
- **Protect development from flood hazards;**
- **Provide an accessible, system of greenways and trails;**
- **Protect wildlife habitat by avoiding fragmentation of habitat areas and corridors;**
- **Minimize development on steep hillsides; and**
- **Provide appropriate recreational opportunities.**

OS-1: Within two years of adoption of the BGG, develop a countywide open space and greenway plan to facilitate the establishment of a coordinated system that helps achieve the open space and natural resource goal. This plan should:

- Involve diverse stakeholders including irrigation, recreation, conservation, agricultural, transportation, flood control, development, neighborhood, and fish and wildlife interests.
- Recognize and integrate open space, trails, and pathway planning completed by each community and the county to date.
- Recommend non-regulatory and regulatory tools such as conservation design subdivisions, tax incentives, transfer of development rights, and wildlife mitigation strategies to achieve open space protection goals.
- Establish context-sensitive natural and active recreation open space standards for non-industrial development projects.

Other comments

- The concept of an open space plan needs to be addressed carefully to focus limited time and resources where it counts. We believe that the development of implementation strategies, ordinances and incentives are at the heart of this next phase. Many of the Cities in Ada county have adopted or are working on Parks Plans in some form. Bringing these efforts together and building off what has been done should be considered. We want to avoid getting stuck in a perpetual planning mode.
- The issue of terminology causes confusion. Parks, pathways, trails, open spaces can be very different yet are often used interchangeably. While some overlap occurs, the distinction is important.
- Page 5...Protecting natural resources will take more than planting trees and flowers. Consider adding ... 'seek funding mechanisms to augment other regulatory and incentive based solutions.'
- P. 18 Public Lands Policy. While good intentioned, the first policy of GM-30 suggests the value of public land is in the ability to site facilities on it. We suggest deleting #1 and moving #2 to the bottom and deleting #5 (not sure why this is here).

Thanks for your efforts!

Cordially,

/S/

Tim M. Breuer, Executive Director

July 27, 2006

RE: Blueprint for Good Growth

Dear Mr. Lauer,

Thank you for allowing us to submit comments on the Blueprint for Good Growth. Idaho Conservation League preserves Idaho's clean water, wilderness and quality of life. As Idaho's largest state-based conservation organization we represent over 9,000 members, more than half of who live in the Treasure Valley.

The Treasure Valley is currently one of the fastest growing communities in the country. Well-planned growth can add value and enjoyment to our quality of life. Poorly planned growth affects our clean air, clean water, wildlife, and open space. It is important our community be involved in decisions on where to encourage growth.

We must keep Ada County special. We should act now to save the county that belongs to all of us. It's our choice. If we continue to allow unlimited development, the county we love may disappear for our children and us.

This is our county, and we should decide for ourselves to protect the things that make Idaho special- our open space, our natural resources, our quiet places in nature, and our clean water. This means placing some limits on development that threaten our quality of life.

We appreciate the time and effort the participants have expended creating this draft plan. We support many of the values and strategies outlined in the plan.

Our main concern focuses on open space. It is inconceivable to us how our community can be planning for growth, without a simultaneous plan for agreements on where we do not want to grow?

As participants in the public forums at the beginning of the Blueprint process, it seemed to have near unanimous consent on the importance of protecting key areas in the Treasure Valley. When presented with maps and an ability to restrict growth from certain areas, nearly everyone marked off the Boise River corridor and the foothills.

Quality of life is a driving factor behind why our community loves the Treasure Valley, and why it is growing so rapidly. Protecting open space is key component of quality of life.

We join with others in strongly encouraging the committee to add a component on open space back into the draft. (*Proposed language attached*) Planning for open space must move forward simultaneously with planning for where growth occurs. We do not have the luxury of time to wait for an open space component as a next step. We are already behind the curve on protecting this valuable resource.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about these comments.

Sincerely,

Rachel Winer
Outreach Coordinator
208-345-6942 x.23
rwiner@wildidaho.org

Open Space and Natural Resources

This plan supports the retention of open space for a wide variety of uses and the responsible use of natural resources that results in the protection of the environmental and aesthetic value of our land, air and water. While efforts to protect air quality will require regional solutions, local land use and transportation decisions could significantly reduce air pollutant generation from automobiles.

Open Space and Natural Resource Goal: To develop an interconnected system of open spaces and natural resource areas that:

- **Protect air quality**
 - **Protect water quality;**
- **Protect development from flood hazards;**
- **Provide an accessible, system of greenways and trails;**
- **Protect wildlife habitat by avoiding fragmentation of habitat areas and corridors;**
- **Minimize development on steep hillsides; and**
- **Provide appropriate recreational opportunities.**

OS-1: Within two years of adoption of the BGG, develop a countywide open space and greenway plan to facilitate the establishment of a coordinated system that helps achieve the open space and natural resource goal. This plan should:

- Involve diverse stakeholders including irrigation, recreation, conservation, agricultural, transportation, flood control, development, neighborhood, and fish and wildlife interests.
- Recognize and integrate open space, trails, and pathway planning completed by each community and the county to date.
- Recommend non-regulatory and regulatory tools such as conservation design subdivisions, tax incentives, transfer of development rights, and wildlife mitigation strategies to achieve open space protection goals.
- Establish context-sensitive natural and active recreation open space standards for non-industrial development projects.

Michael Lauer

From: Kevin Lewis [kevin@idahorivers.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2006 4:47 PM
To: mlauer@ourplanningworks.com
Subject: ***SPAM*** Blueprint for Good Growth Comments

Michael,

In reviewing the most recent draft of the Blueprint for Good Growth, I was surprised to see the deletion of Sec. B - Open Space and Natural Resources.

Idaho Rivers United strongly supports inclusion of Open Space and Natural Resources in the Blueprint for Good Growth. Proactive planning related to the Boise River is essential in preserving river health and addressing the growing issue of floodplain development. Therefore, IRU supports the following language for consideration in the next draft of the Blueprint for Good Growth.

Open Space and Natural Resources

This plan supports the retention of open space for a wide variety of uses and the responsible use of natural resources that results in the protection of the environmental and aesthetic value of our land, air and water. While efforts to protect air quality will require regional solutions, local land use and transportation decisions could significantly reduce air pollutant generation from automobiles.

Open Space and Natural Resource Goal: To develop an interconnected system of open spaces and natural resource areas that:

- **Protect water quality;**
- **Protect development from flood hazards;**
- **Provide an accessible, system of greenways and trails;**
- **Protect wildlife habitat by avoiding fragmentation of habitat areas and corridors;**
- **Minimize development on steep hillsides; and**
- **Provide appropriate recreational opportunities.**

OS-1: Within two years of adoption of the BGG, develop a countywide open space and greenway plan to facilitate the establishment of a coordinated system that helps achieve the open space and natural resource goal. This plan should:

- Involve diverse stakeholders including irrigation, recreation, conservation, agricultural, transportation, flood control, development, neighborhood, and fish and wildlife interests.
- Recognize and integrate open space, trails, and pathway planning completed by each community and the county to date.
- Recommend non-regulatory and regulatory tools such as conservation design subdivisions, tax incentives, transfer of development rights, and wildlife mitigation strategies to achieve open space protection goals.
- Establish context-sensitive natural and active recreation open space standards for non-industrial development projects.

Thanks!
-Kevin

If you love a river...

Kevin Lewis
Conservation Director
Idaho Rivers United
Office (208) 343-7481
Fax (208) 343-9376
Cell (208) 830-4870



MEMORANDUM:

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium

FROM: Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator

DATE: July 25, 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 7/31/06

**Actual Consultant Hours Spent to Date as
of 7/28/06**

<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	955.00	\$ 104,592.55
1249	1/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Carroll	63.50	\$ 5,516.89
1254	3/9/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Slupe	217.00	\$ 6,925.43
1270	4/1/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Melander	22.75	\$ 842.18
1276	5/2/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Piepmeyer	49.65	\$ 3,607.33
1297	5/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Nemec	57.50	\$ 3,965.01
1312	6/30/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Brosious	3.00	\$ 89.16
1319	7/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Hackett	33.00	\$ 2,247.11
1331	8/30/2005	\$ 3,529.41	Total	1401.40	\$ 127,785.65
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	Admin 2004	\$	5.05
1391	2/27/2006	\$ 4,716.91	Meetings 2004	\$	23.50
1399	4/3/2006	\$ 4,716.91	Admin 2005		
1408	5/1/2006	\$ 1,187.50	Meetings 2005		
1422	5/31/2006	\$ 1,187.53	Admin 2006	\$	138.73
1438	6/9/2006	\$ 45,000.00	Meetings 2006	\$	355.45
1439	6/30/2006	\$ 5,714.29			
1449	7/31/2006	\$ 5,714.29			
Total Invoiced to date		\$ 125,928.58			
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		\$ 28,571.42			

Direct Expenses as of 7/28/06

Total \$ 522.73



MEMORANDUM:

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium
FROM: Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator
DATE: July 17, 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

Boise City pledged an additional \$50,000 of funds at the June 6 Consortium meeting. Eagle and Meridian have both pledged another round of funding contingent upon other donations for the other jurisdictions as shown in the attached documents and a fully appropriated scope for the project as well as deliverables to the individual entities.

The funding committee is actively soliciting additional funds from the remaining participating jurisdictions as outlined below.

Jurisdiction	Request	Responsible Funding Member
Ada County	\$ 50,000	Peavey-Derr
Meridian	\$ 30,000	Merrill
Kuna	\$ 20,000	Bieter
Star	\$ 20,000	Peavey-Derr
Garden City	\$ 20,000	Peavey-Derr
ACHD	\$ -	
ITD	\$ -	
Total	\$ 140,000	

After the remaining jurisdictions have pledged their contributions, the deficit should be approximately \$100,000 if all contributions are made according to the table shown above. The funding committee will approach private entities to raise this amount.

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 (330-400 pm) after the August 3 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	150,000	\$50k ea Phase I and II. Addtl \$50k for Phase II in June 2006.
ITD	50,000	
City of Meridian	30,000	
US Environmental Protection Agency	22,500	
City of Eagle	40,000	\$20k each Phase I and II. Phase II pledged in June 2006.
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	1,000	
North End Neighborhood Assn.	300	
Total Contributions	\$ 675,566	

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	(675,566)
Total Deficit (Phase II)	\$ 233,934



Countywide Land Use and Transportation Guide Plan

July 6, 2006

Tom Ryder
489 W Sandstone Ct.
Boise, ID 83702

Dear Mr. Ryder:

Thank you so much for your generous contribution to the Blueprint for Good Growth. This planning effort can only succeed if it gets the support of business and opinion leaders like you.

The Blueprint for Good Growth will ensure the Treasure Valley remains a vibrant and desirable place to live, work and do business. Beyond setting a vision for a future Ada County, the project will create the specific ordinances and policy changes needed to turn planning goals into results on the ground. I believe those who have been deeply involved in the process as well as those who now suggest changes are after the same thing: a strategy to ensure Ada County remains a great place.

Your contribution is greatly appreciated. Please stay involved in this process, which promises to set a strong foundation for our community's future success.

Sincerely,

Karen M. Doherty
Local Project Coordinator
Blueprint for Good Growth, Inc.

CC: Blueprint Consortium members

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