



Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, February 4, 10:00 A.M. to Noon

COMPASS, Conference Room

800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100

Meridian, Idaho

AGENDA

I. Consent Agenda

Page 2 10:05 *A. Approval of the December 3, 2009, Meeting Minutes

II. Discussion Items

10:10 A. Status Report – Adequate Public Facilities Workgroup – Sally Goodell

10:40 B. Discuss March 2010 Consortium Agenda – Matt Stoll

III. Other (11:55)

IV. Adjournment (12:00)

*** Attachments**

T:\FY10\700 Services\761 Blue Print for Good Growth\Steering Committee\agenda02 04 10.doc



Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

**Thursday, December 3, 2009, 10:00 A.M. to Noon
COMPASS, Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho**

Minutes

I. Consent Agenda

A. Approval of the November 5, 2009, Meeting Minutes

Deanna Smith moved and Sherry McKibben seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

II. Discussion Items

A. Review Development Report on Proposed Comprehensive Plan Changes

Maryann Waldinger reviewed the Purpose, Coordination Protocol, Necessary Information and the four Report Elements of the Development Report on proposed comprehensive plan amendments that COMPASS would assist with. The amendments could be developer initiated to accommodate a specific project; or jurisdiction initiated for a change in land use designations or an increase in land use intensity. Maryann requested feedback as to the usefulness of the report for members.

Nichoel Baird Spencer stated that she felt it was good information and asked that, since there is not a threshold determination as to when this process would be warranted, is it left to the city's discretion to determine that by application? Would it be a request to COMPASS by the cities, or can a developer make a request?

Maryann replied that the threshold of 250 single-family units or 25,000 square feet of non-residential space used for the report is consistent with the development review process and felt it is a good starting point for now. Maryann said she would prefer the requests come from the member agencies.

Nichoel said when the city makes a request they would expect to pay the fee. It needs to be clear that if a developer is making the request, the developer would pay the fee.

Sally Goodell commented that it makes sense to have the agencies make the requests as opposed to the developer, as she could not think of a scenario where a developer would make the request. The idea is to be able to provide all of the cities with clear, consistent information that shows the impacts of significant developments.

Nichoel replied that she envisioned the process would be an application requirement. Then it is the developer's responsibility to get it done to meet the requirement of the city, so the request may not come from the city.

Maryann stated that was a valid point. But if it is an application requirement, it needs to be clear. Maryann's concern is if a developer asks for a review prior to the city or county being aware of it.

Caleb Hood suggested using a tiered requirement such as, COMPASS will provide comments to agencies if the threshold is higher than 50,000 square feet, or something significant, so that comments are provided. And COMPASS may provide comments on a request for an analysis on a lesser development that will have a significant impact. Caleb asked if the reporting would be from both Ada and Canyon counties.

Maryann replied the intent is for both counties to participate in the process, and agreed it will be much easier to get the information if it is part of the application process.

Caleb stated for the process to work protocol for transmittal to COMPASS needs to be established.

Matt Stoll said the challenge is the fact that there are some agencies and/or developers that will not participate in or be aware of the process, which is not something that should stop the process from going forward. This will be an incremental change that is going to be of value to the region as a whole.

Sally noted that in Ada County, it is different than in Canyon County; the report is only for a development proposed comprehensive plan change that does not have anything more than a comprehensive plan change. If it has zoning or a specific annexation plan associated with it, then it does not fall under this report.

Nichoel said based on her experience, the thresholds under Purpose seemed high and suggested adding a location threshold on state highways or arterials.

Sally stated she agreed with Caleb's idea that above a certain threshold the analysis is automatically done, even for communities that are not participating or choosing to participate by including it as an application requirement.

Matt said while he sees the merit in that, to be assured that COMPASS hears about all proposed changes, the onus would need to be put on the land use agencies to let COMPASS know.

Justin Lucas stated that ACHD receives all of the development applications in Ada County, so ACHD could forward those on to COMPASS for comment.

Caleb added while everything does go through ACHD, the concern is a city or developer will have already put together and transmitted their package giving only about two weeks for a COMPASS review before the hearing. The COMPASS review needs to be coordinated in the application process early enough to allow ample time so that projects are not delayed while the review is being conducted.

Nichoel asked how the information will be put out to all the communities.

Caleb replied COMPASS can post it on the website in lieu of sending all development reviews to all agencies.

Matt recapped the Steering Committee's recommendation that the Consortium direct Matt to write a letter to the land use agencies requesting that they add COMPASS to the notification list of any major comprehensive plan changes so that COMPASS can comment based on the thresholds, and that the land use agencies make COMPASS review part of their process. This will also be recommended to the COMPASS Board for discussion at the regional level.

Sally suggested that if the Consortium agrees, this should be routed through the Regional Technical Advisory Committee to start the discussion with Canyon County. Matt agreed.

Justin said it needs to be noted that this is not about a review of a specific development. The goal is to inform COMPASS of all comprehensive plan amendments and how they will impact the regional long-range transportation plan.

Matt asked how this process fits into the development review protocol that is used now.

Maryann replied it is strictly for a comprehensive plan amendment that comes outside of a general comprehensive plan update.

Nichoel said that this will clarify when comments are received at the comprehensive plan peer level from COMPASS and ACHD, and how the regional long-range transportation plan will be impacted. Commenting at the comprehensive plan level is a better place to request change than at the development review level.

Meg Rush said that she see this as being beneficial for Ada County, but Ada County needs to get the requests early enough in the process.

Matt stated the letter will request that city councils and commissions integrate COMPASS into their processes early enough so that there is adequate time for COMPASS' review. Currently, COMPASS does not get notification of changes until the last minute and sometimes not at all.

Caleb said while the easiest thing would be to request that COMPASS be added to the transmittal list, it needs to be noted that all comprehensive plan amendments will be commented on, rather than just major or significant amendments. COMPASS staff can then make the determination of whether or not to comment based on the thresholds.

Maryann replied that since this is a new process, if COMPASS needs to review all land use changes to get the process going, then that can be done. Maryann said she will revise the language under Purpose to specify the scope of the process.

Deanna Smith said it is not clear in the title, "Consistency Report for Comprehensive Plan text/map amendments," what the consistency is tied to. Is it just with the preservation?

Maryann replied it is consistency with whatever long-range plan is in effect, but also to help inform and update the preservation demographics on an annual basis. Maryann will make that clearer under Purpose.

Sally discussed the language under the Tracking/Accounting section that says, "COMPASS staff is discussing a process to reconcile the official "control total forecasts" (i.e. 2035 Community Choices) at the TAZ level on an annual basis. The control total numbers will remain unchanged but growth may be shifted between TAZs within subareas." Sally said it is an important statement if we are going to do adequate public facilities and require any mitigation around that. We have a fixed 20 year demographic for the long-range transportation plan and the CIP. If changes are made outside of planned areas, it will blow up any ability to work on the concept of adequate public facilities. As an example, if development happens outside the 20 year planning area and development is pulled out of other developed areas, it will change traffic levels on roads and affect the investment planning, and it will change the definition of planned development. While we are not quite to the point in the process of being able to say how to do the cumulative reporting the next question will be, what are we going to do when a development comes in that significantly impacts the road system? Is it planned development that is in the current CIP or unplanned development? If it is unplanned, there should be additional mitigation requirements put on that development to address the additional impact that they are creating. If we start moving the demographics around annually, we are going to lose the ability to say this is planned or unplanned. Maybe we won't want to do that anyway, but at this moment we do not want to start down that path until we have had the conversation and understand where we want to go with the underlying adequate public facilities concept.

Maryann replied that whether COMPASS is involved or not, we are criticized for not responding to the land use decisions being made. This process is about track ability to get us the base year and informs the cumulative development. The process will have implications on other COMPASS tasks, and will require additional time to be considered, researched and outlined.

Sally agreed it is something we need to figure out. There was an understanding that to make the adequate public facilities piece work, we needed to commit to where the 20 years of growth is going to go. If we move it around, then we cannot do some of the other things.

Deanna said we need to better define when COMPASS "may" comment. And if we are going to follow the original principals of Blueprint, then we need to clearly state what the trigger will be for additional mitigation.

Nichoel stated cities need to know what the implications are when they prioritize growth in other areas. It will be an important discussion to have for the next plan update. City-wide comprehensive plan amendments normally do engage ACHD and COMPASS at the early threshold stage, or they should. It needs to be made clear that this requirement can be met in other ways.

Sally said this is the area that the adequate public facilities work group will look at next.

Charles commented that one of the pieces Maryann included is the TIS protocol, which is the scoping process that will help determine if a change is going to trigger a change in an investment, but that will not be known until a review is done.

Caleb asked how big a “subarea” is.

Maryann replied that there is no defined set of a subarea. It will vary by area and will need to be discussed as it comes up. In some cases, it could be a one or two square mile area. Downtown Boise is a one square mile area, is that considered a subarea? This is something that we are thinking about. It is important and will impact how adequate public facilities are addressed.

Nichoel asked how this work will be identified in the COMPASS UPWP, because we do not know how much time this is going to take. Nichoel asked what the development community thinks of this.

Mark Tate, representing M3 Companies, replied that he thinks this is going in the right direction, much more so than in the first phase under Michael Lauer, but would like to see some level of flexibility to be able to move units around within certain subareas.

Caleb suggested that the next step is to get buy-in from the Consortium, work on some of the details, ask agencies to start transmitting changes to COMPASS so that staff can test the process without charge for six months to identify how much staff time the review will take, and then implement the process.

Matt agreed that this is a good time to do a test drive of the process to determine how much staff time it will take.

Nichoel asked if the cities decide to include this as an application requirement, can the developers ask for an analysis before bringing in an application.

Matt replied the letter to the land use agencies could be worded in such a way.

Meg commented that it should be noted to the Consortium that this process is what was accomplished in 2009, for use in 2010 for first time.

Mark stated that the next step will be the most important to developers. It will allow the developers to know early on in the development as to what will be required in terms of adequate public facilities, fees, etc.

Deanna noted to stress in the letter that COMPASS would encourage jurisdictions to make this part of the pre-application process.

B. Status Report - Proposed Development Review Changes

Justin Lucas presented the draft report on Cumulative Impacts for Development Review and walked the committee through a sample application highlighting new areas of information that have been added to the staff report:

- Planned Demographics: 20 year transportation plan and reported TAZ
- Map of Area of Influence as defined in the TIS

- Cumulative Impacts (Road Segments) (LOS calculations include funded improvements in the first three years of the FYWP)
- Cumulative Impacts (Intersections) (LOS calculations include funded improvements in the first three years of the FYWP)

The following edits were suggested under the Cumulative Impacts (Intersections) and (Road Segments) Committed + Proposed Development columns:

- E (75 sec) should read E (75 sec in delay) or define what it means at the bottom of the graph.
- Define E V/C as volume to capacity
- Define N/A, and note why
- Note when something is an ACHD policy
- Put ACHD policy in the report
- Clarify the lead land use agency
- Note arterial roadways
- Note whose level of service is being affected
- Report volumes on segments

Sally said, regarding segments, volumes will be compared to planning thresholds.

Justin asked the committee for suggestions as to other things to use and consider.

Charles Trainor asked if one element would be constrained corridors. Justin agreed that would be part of the analysis.

Nichoel asked if any additional timing issues are anticipated for the review of the information in correlation to the application review.

Justin replied that most of it will be made a requirement of the TIS preparer. ACHD can start the TIS review process before the cities transmit an application.

Sally said the piece that will take time is updating the intersections with cumulative impacts. It should all fall into place if it is incorporated into the TIS process.

Maryann said when the information is good the special model runs go faster. We just need to put it in place and see how it goes. We just don't know yet what the staff time will be.

Caleb said the cities need to let COMPASS know when COMPASS needs to be involved, as early as the pre-application level.

Nichoel stated all cities have timelines in their codes regarding processing applications, and they may need to be tweaked to make sure the process works in those timelines.

Caleb asked if ACHD envisions additional fees being required or is this just a service.

Sally replied that the only additional fee would be if COMPASS has to do an additional model run. Caleb said the elected officials will want to know that information regarding staff time and cost.

Caleb commented that he likes the ACHD policy shift of accepting the TISs early in the process. He requested that a policy be incorporated directing ACHD to notify the land use agencies when ACHD receives a TIS from the developer to ensure that the city is ready for ACHD to review the TIS and to ensure it is current.

Justin replied that ACHD does look at the application when they receive a TIS to make sure they match. The point in taking a TIS in early is so that there is enough time to review it. Justin said it is up to the developer as to what he wants reviewed.

Sally stated at the last DAC meeting, the cities were not comfortable with the 20 year demographics. If the cities are not comfortable with the demographics the report is meaningless.

Maryann replied that there is a funded project list for the CIM update, which RTAC reviewed in November 2009. Due to the financial situation, some of the projects that were in the funded list have been moved to illustrative (unfunded). The smaller funded transportation network has been tested on the 2035, one million population forecast. The new transportation network and the demand on it will be fed back into the land use model. Another demographic allocation will be sent to the jurisdictions for review of what is in their boundaries and control totals. The jurisdictions will have one month to get information back to COMPASS, no later than January 30, 2010.

Matt asked if there would be a transmittal process from member agencies back to COMPASS. Maryann said that has been discussed, but the details have not been worked out yet.

Nichoel said to give at least 30 days for the jurisdictions to reply.

Caleb asked if the new model run with the constrained plan is going to be in the CIM update. Charles replied that it would be, with the provision that we are starting in 2011 with the next update.

Caleb said the reason the cities were uncomfortable at the DAC meeting was because there was some last minute tweaking: some of the jobs moved and population moved, but it wasn't explained. Carl was going to post an explanation on the website. If all that was done was to make the ratio better, just explain that to the cities after the next model run. And if there is more tweaking, it needs to be explained as well.

Matt replied that was a reasonable request. There is also a desire by some of the members to review the TAZs as well.

Meg added that this information will be used for the CIM update and the CIP update.

Sally said the next CIP update is a major update and having the cities comfortable with the 20 year demographics is important.

Caleb said he would like the cities to be allowed to set their own priorities.

Maryann said that would work for Meridian.

Matt said that in the past there have been situations where one jurisdiction wanted to rob from another or wanted to stop growth in another part of the region. The purpose of the letter is to get on record that there was buy-off on the growth projections in the long-range plan and to address any issues so that an informed decision can be made.

Maryann said the letters will go out late December 2009 or early January 2010 giving jurisdictions a month for review and to get back to COMPASS.

Sally said if we need an extra month to get better numbers that everyone is comfortable with then take it out another month; but she acknowledged that COMPASS has different time constraints.

Matt replied that the constraint is that the long-range transportation plan lapses after August 2010. The reality is the lapse could delay any update of the transportation improvement program, affecting the expenditure of any dollars beyond that existing TIP.

Nichoel said that staff needs to know the final date in order to put it on council and commissions agendas.

Matt stated that based on the timeline, COMPASS will need responses back by January 30, 2010. Staff will work backwards from there to determine when we need to get the information to the jurisdictions so that they have 30 days to respond.

III. Action Items

A. **Recommend 2010 Steering/Technical Committee and Consortium Meeting Dates**

Steering/Technical Committee:

- February 4, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm
- May 6, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm
- August 5, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm
- November 4, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm

Consortium:

- March 11, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
- June 10, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
- September 9, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
- December 9, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm

After discussion, **Nichoel Baird Spencer moved and Deanna Smith seconded recommending Consortium approval of the proposed meeting schedules with the latitude to add more Steering/Technical Committee meetings as necessary. Motion passed unanimously.**

IV. Other

Deanna Smith reported that she would present the Public Outreach Work Group's report and presentation developed for newly elected officials and staff to the Steering Committee at the February 2010 meeting.

Matt stated he received a request from Clay Carley of Old Boise LLC and Karen Doherty of HDR to hold a forum at the March 2010 Consortium meeting to propose that the Consortium members consider how they can incentivize downtown development in any of the cities in Ada County by reducing impact fees or abating taxes for downtown development. This fits within the growth scenarios for both Blueprint and Community Choices.

Sherry noted if this is based on the assumption that there is infrastructure in place downtown, there needs to be an analysis done to see if the infrastructure is really there.

Nichoel said she had no problem with Clay coming to the Consortium but suggested that he create a subcommittee to develop recommendations that are broader based and to study the full depth of the issue.

Deanna noted that there are other efforts going on that are parallel to this such as the ULI report on infill.

Nichoel added this is an opportunity to bring in the urban renewal agencies that have strategies they can use beyond those of the jurisdictions or ACHD.

Sherry said the ULI Task Force is currently looking at that.

Matt said Clay told him that Elaine Clegg's committee will be coming out with recommendations as well. Matt recommended that Clay contact ULI regarding what they are doing and try to incorporate that into the process.

Deanna said ULI is working in tandem with Elaine's group working on infill. The ULI's mayors' forum is focused on downtown development in the two counties.

After discussion, **the Committee recommendation was to allow Clay's delegation to talk, but to encourage Clay to talk about incentivizing downtown development not limited to the reduction of fees or taxes; and to invite Idaho Smart Growth to share their report; and to invite Ed Miller to report on the ULI Task Force.**

V. Adjournment

By unanimous consent the meeting was adjourned.

T:\FY10\700 Services\761 Blue Print for Good Growth\Steering Committee\Minutes\minutes12 03 09.doc

**Steering/Technical Committee Meeting
SIGN-IN SHEET**

Date: December 3, 2009

Name	Representing	Substituting For	Phone #
1. Mott Soll	COMPASS		
2. Charles Trainor	COMPASS		
3. Mely Rush	COMPASS Ada County		287-5715
4. Richard Beck	Ada County		287-7915
5. CALEB HROD	MERIDIAN	ANNA CANNING	884-5533
6. Nichol Baird Spencer	Eagle		939-0227
7. Desana Smith	Idaho Smart Growth		333-9066
8. Sherry Matheson	University of Idaho		364-4540
9. Sally Goodell	ACHD		387-6129
10. MaryAnn Waldinger	COMPASS		
11. Phil Choate	ITD		334-8901
12. Mark Tate	MB		939-6263
13. JUSTIN LUCAS	ACHD		389-0157
14. AMAR PILLAI	ACHD		387-6238
15. Nancy Bredy	COMPASS		
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.			
22.			
23.			